arXiv:1609.02093v1 [math.KT] 7 Sep 2016

DYNAMIC ASYMPTOTIC DIMENSION AND CONTROLLED OPERATOR K-THEORY

ERIK GUENTNER, RUFUS WILLETT, AND GUOLIANG YU

Abstract. In earlier work the authors introduced dynamic asymptotic dimension, a notion of dimension for topological dynamical systems that is finite for many interesting examples. In this paper, we use finiteness of dynamic asymptotic dimension of an action to get information on the K-theory of the associated crossed product C^*-algebra: specifically, we give a new proof of the Baum-Connes conjecture for such actions. The key tool is controlled K-theory, as developed by Oyono-Oyono and the third author. Our main result is not new: it follows from work of Tu on amenable groupoids. The proof, however, is very different: it amounts to a computation of the K-theory of a crossed product which is quite independent of the topological formula posited by the Baum-Connes machinery.

We have tried to keep the paper as self-contained as possible: we hope the main part of the paper will be accessible to someone with the equivalent of a first course in operator K-theory. In particular, we do not assume prior knowledge of controlled K-theory, and use a new and concrete model for the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients that requires no bivariant K-theory to set up.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Assembly maps 6
3. Groupoids and decompositions 12
4. Controlled K-theory 17
5. Strategy of proof of Theorem 2.10 22
6. Base of the induction 25

K-theoretic part 25

Dynamical part 32

7. Inductive step 36

K-theoretic part 37

Dynamical part 46

Appendix A. Comparison to the Baum-Connes assembly map 55

Paschke duality square 62

Localization algebra square 76

References 79

1. Introduction

The Baum-Connes conjecture for an action $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ of a discrete group on a compact space by homeomorphisms – a special case of the Baum-Connes conjecture for Γ with coefficients [1] – posits the existence of an isomorphism

$$K K_*^{\mathrm{top}}(\Gamma, C(X)) \to K_*(C(X) \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

from a topologically defined group associated to the action, to the operator K-theory of the reduced crossed product C^*-algebra $C(X) \rtimes_r \Gamma$, an analytically defined object. The existence of such an isomorphism relating two quite different aspects of the action has important consequences for both: for example, it has consequences for Novikov-type conjectures associated to Γ, and implies the existence of various tools to better understand the K-theory of the crossed product.

In this paper, we prove the Baum-Connes conjecture for an action with finite *dynamic asymptotic dimension*, a notion introduced by the authors in earlier work [3]. Before giving a detailed statement, let us give some general comments. First, this is not a new theorem! It follows from a special case of work of Tu [20] on the Baum-Connes conjecture for amenable groupoids. Some of the key tools in Tu's proof are the Dirac-dual-Dirac method of Kasparov [9], the work of Higson

and Kasparov on the Baum-Connes conjecture for a-T-menable groups [4], and Le Gall's groupoid-equivariant bivariant K-theory [11]. The proof we give here is completely different: the key inspiration is the third author's work [24] on the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture for spaces with finite asymptotic dimension. Our proof is essentially a direct way of understanding the group $K_*(C(X) \rtimes_r \Gamma)$ via the controlled K-theory developed by the third author in collaboration with Oyono-Oyono [12], and Mayer-Vietoris arguments.

Traditionally, Mayer-Vietoris arguments in operator K-theory require the existence of non-trivial ideals, which play the role of open sets in the classical Mayer-Vietoris sequence of algebraic topology. However, our 'controlled' Mayer-Vietoris arguments work even for simple C^*-algebras; indeed, many of the crossed products that fall under the purview of the main result are simple. In principal, the techniques give an 'algorithm' for computing the K-theory of a (possibly simple) C^*-algebra satisfying certain structural properties. We emphasize that we mean 'algorithm' here in the sense 'set of rules to be followed in computation', not in the precise sense 'could be implemented by a computer', and even less in the strong sense 'has been implemented by a computer'! Applying this 'algorithm' in specific cases is a challenging problem, but we suspect the techniques should find broader application: indeed, the recent work of Oyono-Oyono and the third author on the Künneth formula [13] is a development of related ideas along these lines.

In order to make a precise statement of the main result, let us start with some conventions. The symbol '$\Gamma \curvearrowright X$' will always mean that Γ is a countable discrete group, X is a compact Hausdorff space, and Γ acts on X by homeomorphisms. We will abbreviate this information by saying that '$\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is an action'. We assume that Γ is equipped with a proper length function as in the following definition.

Definition 1.1. A *length function* on a group Γ is a function $|\cdot| : \Gamma \to \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(i) $|g| = 0$ if and only if $g = e$ (where e is the identity element of Γ);
(ii) $|gh| \leqslant |g| + |h|$;
(iii) $|g^{-1}| = |g|$;

(iv) for any $r \geqslant 0$, $\{g \in \Gamma \mid |g| \leqslant r\}$ is finite.

The length function is *proper* if for any n, the set $l^{-1}(n)$ is finite. Associated to such a length function is a metric defined by $d(g,h) := |gh^{-1}|$.

Note that the right action of the group on itself preserves the metric associated to a length function, and that if the length function is proper, then for any $r \geqslant 0$ there is a uniform bound on the cardinality of all r-balls. Examples of length functions and associated metrics are provided by word metrics associated to finite generating sets, when such exist. Length functions always exist on a countable group, whether or not it is finitely generated, and the metrics they define are unique up to 'coarse' (large-scale) equivalence: see for example [22, Proposition 2.3.3]. Our use of a length function will only depend on the coarse equivalence class, and therefore fixing one makes no real difference.

Definition 1.2. Let $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be an action. The *dynamic asymptotic dimension* of $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is the smallest $d \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property: for each $r \geqslant 0$ there is an open cover $U_0, ..., U_d$ of X and $s \geqslant 0$ such that if

$$x,\ g_1 x,\ g_2 g_1 x,\ ...,\ g_n \cdots g_2 g_1 x$$

are all elements of the same U_i, and if $|g_k| \leqslant r$ for each k, then $|g_n \cdots g_2 g_1| \leqslant s$.

In words, one can split up X into $d+1$ open sets $U_0, ..., U_d$ such that however much you bounce around in each U_i using group elements of length at most r, you will only ever recover the group action of elements of length at most s.

The main result of the paper is as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be an action with finite dynamic asymptotic dimension, where X is a second countable compact space. Then the Baum-Connes conjecture holds for Γ with coefficients in $C(X)$.*

The hypotheses cover many interesting actions: we refer the reader to our companion paper [3], particularly the introduction, for a discussion. Via standard descent techniques, the theorem above also reproves the

Novikov conjecture for groups with finite asymptotic dimension and finite classifying space.

As we stated above, Theorem 1.3 is a (less general!) version of a result of Tu. Our motivations for giving a new proof are threefold. First we want to make the Baum-Connes theory more direct so that it might be adapted to computations of K-theory for much more general classes of C^*-algebras; we already suggested this earlier in the introduction. Second, we want to make techniques from the Baum-Connes theory more algebraic, so as to highlight and strengthen interactions with the Farrell-Jones theory in algebraic topology.

Third, the proof is self-contained: we have tried to make it accessible to a reader who has understood an introduction to C^*-algebra K-theory such as [18] or [21]. In particular, we hope that the paper can be read without prior knowledge of Baum-Connes theory, groupoids, controlled K-theory, or even crossed product C^*-algebras. This makes the proof more elementary than most existing proofs of special cases of the Baum-Connes conjecture; indeed, we think the proof is more elementary than most existing statements of the Baum-Connes conjecture. In order to do this, we introduce a direct geometric / combinatorial reformulation of the Baum-Connes conjecture; we show that it agrees with the traditional one using Kasparov's KK-theory [1] in an appendix.

Outline of the paper. Section 2 builds a concrete model for the Baum-Connes assembly map for an action $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ based on the localization algebras used by the third author to give a model for the coarse Baum-Connes assembly map [23]. Section 3 introduces some language from groupoid theory that will be useful in carrying out various decompositions. Section 4 gives a self-contained description of the controlled K-theory groups we will need for the proof, based on work of the third author [24], and of the third author and Oyono-Oyono [12]. Section 5 lays out the strategy for proving Theorem 1.3, which is based roughly on the proof of the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture for spaces with finite asymptotic dimension of the third author [24], and reduces the proof to two technical propositions. These technical propositions are proved in Sections 6 and 7. Appendix A (which is about a third of the paper) identifies our model for the Baum-Connes assembly map with one of the standard models using KK-theory; as such, it requires

rather more background than the rest of the paper. The appendix is included to connect what we have done here to the existing theory, and is certainly not needed to understand the rest of the paper.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank each other, and each others' home institutions (The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, the Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences, and Texas A&M University), for their hospitality during some of the work on this project. We would also like to thank Yeong Chyuan Chung for some helpful comments on an earlier draft.

The first author was partially supported by the Simons Foundation (#245398). The second author was partially supported by the US NSF (DMS-1401126 and DMS-1564281). The third author was partially supported by the US NSF (DMS-1362772 and DMS-1564281) and the NSFC (NSFC11420101001). The authors gratefully acknowledge this support.

2. Assembly maps

Throughout this section, $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is an action in our usual sense: Γ is a countable discrete group, X is a compact Hausdorff topological space, and Γ acts on X by homeomorphisms. We also assume that Γ is equipped with a proper length function and the associated right invariant metric as in Definition 1.1.

Our goal in this section is to develop a concrete and elementary model for the Baum-Connes assembly map for Γ with coefficients in $C(X)$. The construction is modeled on the localization algebra approach to the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture of the third author [23].

Definition 2.1. Let $s \geqslant 0$. The *Rips complex of* Γ *at scale* s, denoted $P_s(\Gamma)$, is the simplicial complex with vertex set Γ, and where a finite subset E of Γ spans a simplex if and only if

$$d(g,h) \leqslant s \text{ for all } g,h \in E. \tag{2.1}$$

Points $z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ can be written as formal linear combinations

$$z = \sum_{g \in \Gamma} t_g g,$$

where each t_g is in $[0,1]$ and $\sum_{g\in\Gamma} t_g = 1$. We equip the space $P_s(\Gamma)$ with the *ℓ^1-metric*

$$d\Big(\sum_{g\in\Gamma} t_g g, \sum_{g\in\Gamma} s_g g\Big) = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} |t_g - s_g|.$$

The *barycentric coordinates* on $P_s(\Gamma)$ are the continuous functions $(t_g : P_s(\Gamma) \to [0,1])_{g\in\Gamma}$ indexed by $g \in \Gamma$ that are uniquely determined by the condition

$$z = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} t_g(z) g$$

for all $z \in P_s(\Gamma)$.

Using the fact that balls of radius s in Γ are (uniformly) finite, it is straightforward to check that $P_s(\Gamma)$ is finite dimensional and locally compact. Note also that the right translation action of Γ on itself extends to a right action of Γ on $P_s(\Gamma)$ by (isometric) simplicial automorphisms.

We now want to build Hilbert spaces and C^*-algebras connected to both the large scale geometry of Γ (called 'Roe algebras') and the topological structure of $P_s(\Gamma)$ (called 'localization algebras').

Definition 2.2. For each $s \geqslant 0$, define

$$Z_s := \left\{ \sum_{g\in\Gamma} t_g g \in P_s(\Gamma) \;\middle|\; t_g \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ for all } g \in \Gamma \right\}.$$

Note that Z_s is Γ-invariant, so the Γ-action on $P_s(\Gamma)$ induces a (right) action on each Z_s.

Let $\ell^2(Z_s)$ denote the Hilbert space of square-summable functions on Z_s. Let $\ell^2(X)$ denote the Hilbert space of square-summable functions on X. Fix also a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space H, and define

$$H_s := \ell^2(Z_s) \otimes \ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma).$$

Equip H_s with the unitary Γ action defined for $g \in \Gamma$ by

$$u_g : \delta_z \otimes \delta_x \otimes \eta \otimes \delta_h \mapsto \delta_{zg^{-1}} \otimes \delta_{gx} \otimes \eta \otimes \delta_{gh},$$

where $z \in Z_s$, $x \in X$, $\eta \in H$ and $h \in \Gamma$. When convenient, we will use the canonical identification

$$H_s = \ell^2(Z_s \times X, H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)) \tag{2.2}$$

of H_s with the Hilbert space of square-summable functions from $Z_s \times X$ to $H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$.

Note that if $s_0 \leqslant s$ then $P_{s_0}(\Gamma)$ identifies equivariantly and isometrically with a subcomplex of $P_s(\Gamma)$, and moreover $Z_{s_0} \subseteq Z_s$. Hence there are canonical equivariant isometric inclusions

$$H_{s_0} \subseteq H_s \tag{2.3}$$

which we will use many times below.

Write now $\mathcal{K}_\Gamma$ for the compact operators on $H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$ equipped with the Γ action by $*$-automorphisms that is induced by the tensor product of the trivial action on H and the left regular representation on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$. Equip the C^*-algebra $C(X, \mathcal{K}_\Gamma) = C(X) \otimes \mathcal{K}_\Gamma$ of continuous functions from X to $\mathcal{K}_\Gamma$ with the diagonal action of Γ induced by the actions on $C(X)$ and $\mathcal{K}_\Gamma$. Note that the natural faithful representation of $C(X, \mathcal{K}_\Gamma)$ on $\ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$ is covariant for the unitary representation defined by tensoring the natural permutation action on $\ell^2(X)$, the trivial representation on H, and the regular representation on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$.

Definition 2.3. Let T be a bounded operator on H_s. We may think of T as a $Z_s \times Z_s$-indexed matrix $T = (T_{y,z})$, where each entry is a bounded operator on $\ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$. We will be interested in the following properties of such T.

(i) T is Γ-*invariant* if $u_g T u_g^* = T$ for all $g \in \Gamma$.

(ii) The *Rips-propagation* of T is the number

$$r = \sup\{d_{P_s(\Gamma)}(y, z) \mid T_{y,z} \neq 0\}.$$

(iii) The Γ-*propagation* of T is the supremum (possibly infinite) of the set

$$\{d_\Gamma(g, h) \mid T_{y,z} \neq 0 \text{ for some } y, z \in Z_s \text{ with } t_g(y) \neq 0,\ t_h(z) \neq 0\},$$

where $t_g, t_h : P_s(\Gamma) \to [0, 1]$ are the barycentric coordinates associated to g and h as in Definition 2.1 above.

(iv) T is X-*locally compact* if for all $y, z \in Z_s$, $T_{y,z}$ is in the C^*-subalgebra $C(X, \mathcal{K}_\Gamma)$ of the bounded operators on $\ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$, and moreover if for any compact subset K of $P_s(\Gamma)$, the set

$$\{(y, z) \in K \times K \mid T_{y,z} \neq 0\}$$

is finite.

Remark 2.4. (This remark relates the definition above to earlier ones in the literature, and can be safely ignored by readers who do not know the earlier material). Traditionally in this area (see for example [23]) one defines a suitable length metric on each Rips complex $P_s(\Gamma)$, and uses only the propagation defined relative to this metric. We have 'decoupled' the notion of propagation into the Γ-propagation (relevant only for large-scale structure) and the Rips-propagation (relevant only for small scale structure). The reason for doing this is that in the traditional approach the metric depends on the Rips parameter s, and it is convenient for us to have metrics that do *not* vary in this way.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ denote the collection of all Γ-invariant, X-locally compact operators on H_s, with finite Γ-propagation. It is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ is a $*$-algebra of bounded operators.

Let $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ denote the closure of $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ with respect to the operator norm. The C^*-algebra $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ is called the *Roe algebra* of $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ at scale s.

We will always consider $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ and $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ as concretely represented on H_s, and equipped with the corresponding operator norm. Elements of $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ can be thought of as matrices $(T_{y,z})_{y,z \in Z_s}$ with entries continuous equivariant functions $T_{y,z} : X \to \mathcal{K}_\Gamma$ in a way that is compatible with the $*$-algebra structure; we will frequently use this description below.

Remark 2.6. The Roe algebras $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ are all isomorphic to the stabilization of the reduced crossed product C^*-algebra $C(X) \rtimes_r \Gamma$. We do not need this remark in the main body of the paper, but include it now as it may help orient some readers. See Appendix A for a proof.

Note that the Rips-propagation is not relevant to the definition of the Roe algebras; it is, however, used in a crucial way in the next definition.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathbb{C}_L[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ denote the $*$-algebra of all bounded, uniformly continuous functions

$$a : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$$

such that the Γ-propagation of $a(t)$ is uniformly finite as t varies, and so that the Rips-propagation of $a(t)$ tends to zero as t tends to infinity.

Let $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ denote the completion of $\mathbb{C}_L[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ for the norm

$$\|a\| := \sup_{t\in[0,\infty)} \|a(t)\|_{C^*(\Gamma\curvearrowright X;s)}.$$

The C^*-algebra $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ is called the *localization algebra* of $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ at scale s.

Note that an element a of $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ comes from a unique bounded, uniformly continuous functions

$$a : [0, \infty) \to C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$$

(satisfying some additional properties). We will think of $\mathbb{C}_L[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ and $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ as concretely represented on the Hilbert space $L^2[0, \infty) \otimes H_s$ in the obvious way.

Finally in this section, we come to the definition of the assembly map. First, let

$$\epsilon_0 : K_*(C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)) \to K_*(C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)) \tag{2.4}$$

denote the evaluation-at-zero $*$-homomorphism $a \mapsto a(0)$. Say that $s_0 \leqslant s$. Then the isometric equivariant inclusion $H_{s_0} \subseteq H_s$ from line (2.3) above induces isometric inclusions

$$C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s_0) \subseteq C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s) \quad \text{and} \quad C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s_0) \subseteq C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$$

of C^*-algebras, and thus to directed systems $\big(C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)\big)_{s\geqslant 0}$ and $\big(C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)\big)_{s\geqslant 0}$ of C^*-algebra inclusions. Moreover the evaluation-at-zero maps from line (2.4) are clearly compatible with these inclusions, whence we may make the following definition.

Definition 2.8. The *assembly map* for $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is the direct limit

$$\epsilon_0 : \lim_{s\to\infty} K_*(C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)) \to \lim_{s\to\infty} K_*(C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s))$$

of the evaluation-at-zero maps from line (2.4) above.

Remark 2.9. This map identifies naturally with the Baum-Connes assembly map for Γ with coefficients in $C(X)$, whence the name. Analogously to Remark 2.6 above, we do not need this fact in the main body of the paper, but include it now in case it is helpful for some readers. See Appendix A for a proof.

Our main goal in this paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be an action with finite dynamic asymptotic dimension. Then the assembly map is an isomorphism.*

Remark 2.11. Thanks to the results of Appendix A, this is the same result as Theorem 1.3 from the introduction, although without the assumption that X is second countable. The only reason for including second countability of X in the statement of Theorem 1.3 is to avoid technical complications that arise in the traditional statement of the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients in a non-separable C^*-algebra. Assuming separability would make no difference for the proof of Theorem 2.10, however, so we omit the assumption here.

In order to prove this theorem, it is convenient to shift attention to an 'obstruction group'.

Definition 2.12. Let $C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ denote the C^*-subalgebra of $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ consisting of functions a such that $a(0) = 0$. The C^*-algebra $C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ is called the *obstruction algebra* of $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ at scale s.

There is clearly a directed system $\left(C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)\right)_{s \geqslant 0}$ of obstruction algebras. The following straightforward lemma explains the terminology 'obstruction algebra': the K-theory of these algebras obstructs isomorphism of the assembly map.

Lemma 2.13. *The assembly map of Definition 2.8 is an isomorphism if and only if*

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} K_*(C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)) = 0.$$

Proof. The short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s) \longrightarrow C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s) \longrightarrow C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s) \longrightarrow 0$$

gives rise to six term exact sequence in K-theory. The lemma follows from this, continuity of K-theory under direct limits, and the fact that exactness is preserved under direct limits of abelian groups. □

Thus in order to prove Theorem 2.10, it suffices to prove that the group in the statement of Lemma 2.13 vanishes whenever $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ has

finite dynamic asymptotic dimension. The proof of this occupies the next five sections. We spend the next two sections developing machinery: in Section 3 we study the structure of the obstruction algebras in more detail, and deduce the existence of subalgebras coming from subgroupoids of the action $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ in an appropriate sense; and in Section 4 we discuss controlled K-theory, which gives us extra flexibility when performing K-theoretic computations.

Having built this machinery, Section 5 sketches out the strategy of the proof of Theorem 2.10: the basic idea is to use dynamic asymptotic dimension in an appropriate form to decompose our obstruction algebras into subalgebras coming from subgroupoids as in Section 3 and prove an analogue of Theorem 2.10 for each separately; this sets up the base case for an induction on the number of subgroupoids, and a Mayer-Vietoris type argument using the controlled K-theory of Section 4 completes the proof. The proofs of the base case and the inductive step are both somewhat technical, and are carried out in Sections 6 and 7 respectively.

3. Groupoids and decompositions

Our goal in this section is to show how 'subgroupoids' of the action $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ give rise to C^*-subalgebras of the Roe algebras and localization algebras of Section 2. We try to keep the exposition self-contained: in particular, we do not assume that the reader has any background in the theory of locally compact groupoids or their C^*-algebras.

Throughout this section $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is an action in our usual sense: Γ is a countable discrete group acting and X is a compact space equipped with an action of a Γ by homeomorphisms. We also fix a proper length function on Γ and associated right-invariant metric as in Definition 1.1.

Definition 3.1. The *transformation groupoid* associated to $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$, denoted $\Gamma \ltimes X$, is defined as follows. As a set, $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is equal to

$$\{(gx, g, x) \in X \times \Gamma \times X \mid g \in \Gamma, x \in X\}.$$

The set $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is equipped with the topology such that the (bijective) projection $\Gamma \ltimes X \to \Gamma \times X$ onto the second and third factors is a homeomorphism.

The topological space $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is equipped with the following additional structure.

(i) A pair $\big((hy, h, y), (gx, g, x)\big)$ of elements of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is *composable* if $y = gx$. If the pair is composable, their *product* is defined by
$$(hgx, h, gx)(gx, g, x) := (hgx, hg, x).$$

(ii) The *inverse* of an element (gx, g, x) of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is defined by
$$(gx, g, x)^{-1} := (x, g^{-1}, gx).$$

(iii) The *units* are the elements of the open and closed subspace
$$G^{(0)} := \{(x, e, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid x \in X\}$$
of $\Gamma \ltimes X$.

We can now discuss the algebra of supports of elements in the Roe algebra. For this, recall from Definitions 2.3 and 2.5 that we can think of an operator T in $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ as a matrix $(T_{y,z})_{y,z \in Z_s}$ indexed by Z_s with entries continuous functions $T_{y,z} : X \to \mathcal{K}_\Gamma$.

Definition 3.2. Let $s \geqslant 0$, and let $P_s(\Gamma)$ be the associated Rips complex with barycentric coordinates $t_g : P_s(\Gamma) \to [0, 1]$ as in Definition 2.1. Define the *support* of $z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ to be the finite subset
$$\operatorname{supp}(z) := \{g \in \Gamma \mid t_g(z) \neq 0\}$$
of Γ. Define the *support* of $T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ to be the subset
$$\operatorname{supp}(T) := \left\{ \begin{array}{c|l} (gx, gh^{-1}, hx) & \text{there are } y, z \in P_s(\Gamma) \text{ with } T_{y,z}(x) \neq 0 \\ \in \Gamma \ltimes X & \text{and } g \in \operatorname{supp}(y),\ h \in \operatorname{supp}(z) \end{array} \right\}$$
of $\Gamma \ltimes X$.

Supports of operators behave well with respect to composition and adjoints; this is the content of the next lemma. To state it, note that the groupoid operations on $\Gamma \ltimes X$ extend to subsets in natural ways: if $A, B \subseteq \Gamma \ltimes X$ then we define
$$A^{-1} := \{a^{-1} \mid a \in A\} \quad \text{and} \quad AB := \{ab \mid a \in A, b \in B \text{ and } (a, b) \text{ composable}\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $S, T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$. Then*
$$\operatorname{supp}(S^*) = \operatorname{supp}(S)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{supp}(ST) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(S)\operatorname{supp}(T).$$

Proof. As the adjoint of S has matrix entries $(S^*)_{y,z} = S^*_{z,y}$, the statement about adjoints is clear. To see the statement about multiplication, say $T, S \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$, and (gx, gh^{-1}, hx) is a point in the support of TS. Then there are $y, z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ such that $g \in \mathrm{supp}(y)$, $h \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$, and $(TS)_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$. Hence there is $w \in P_s(\Gamma)$ with $T_{y,w}(x) \neq 0$, and $S_{w,z}(x) \neq 0$. Say k is any point in $\mathrm{supp}(w)$, so we must have that (gx, gk^{-1}, kx) is in the support of T and (kx, kh^{-1}, hx) is in the support of S. As

$$(gx, gh^{-1}, hx) = (gx, gk^{-1}, kx)(kx, kh^{-1}, hx),$$

this shows that the support of TS is contained in the product of the supports of T and S. □

The lemma implies that subspaces of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ that are closed under the groupoid operations will give rise to $*$-subalgebras of $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$. The relevant algebraic notion is that of a subgroupoid as in the next definition.

Definition 3.4. Let $\Gamma \ltimes X$ be the transformation groupoid associated to the action $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$. A *subgroupoid* of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is a subset G of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ closed under the operations in the following sense.

(i) If (hgx, h, gx) and (gx, g, x) are in G, then so is the composition (hgx, hg, x).
(ii) If (gx, g, x) is in G, then so is its inverse (x, g^{-1}, gx).
(iii) If (gx, g, x) is in G, then so are the units (x, e, x) and (gx, e, gx).

A subgroupoid is equipped with the subspace topology inherited from $\Gamma \ltimes X$.

The following lemma is now almost clear.

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$. Define $\mathbb{C}[G; s]$ to be the subspace of $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ consisting of all operators T with support contained in a compact subset of G. Then $\mathbb{C}[G; s]$ is a $*$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.3 gives most of this: the only remaining point to check is that a product of two relatively compact subsets of G is relatively compact, which we leave it to the reader (or see for example [3, Lemma 5.2] for a more general statement and proof). □

Using this lemma, the following definitions make sense.

Definition 3.6. Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$. Let $\mathbb{C}_L[G; s]$ denote the $*$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}_L[\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s]$ (see Definition 2.7 above) consisting of all a such that $\bigcup_t \operatorname{supp}(a(t))$ has compact closure inside G. Let $\mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G; s]$ denote the ideal of $\mathbb{C}_L[G; s]$ consisting of functions such that $a(0) = 0$.

Let $C^*(G; s)$, $C^*_L(G; s)$, and $C^*_{L,0}(G; s)$ denote the closures of $\mathbb{C}[G; s]$, $\mathbb{C}_L[G; s]$, and $\mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G; s]$ inside $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$, $C^*_L(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$, and $C^*_{L,0}(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ respectively.

Note that the if $G = \Gamma \ltimes X$ then $C^*(G; s)$ is just $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$, and similarly for the localization and obstruction algebras.

Remark 3.7. (This remark may be safely ignored by readers who do not have any background in groupoids and the associated C^*-algebras). Analogously to Remark 2.6, for any open subgroupoid G of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, the C^*-algebra $C^*(G; s)$ is Morita equivalent to the reduced groupoid C^*-algebra $C^*_r(G)$ (this makes sense, as an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ is étale so has a canonical Haar system given by counting measures). We only include this remark as it might help to orient some readers; we will not use it in any way, or prove it.

In the remainder of this section, we construct filtrations on these C^*-algebras in the sense of the definition below, and discuss how they interact with the subalgebras coming from groupoids above.

Definition 3.8. A *filtration* on a C^*-algebra A is a collection of self-adjoint subspaces $(A_r)_{r \geqslant 0}$ of A indexed by the non-negative real numbers that satisfies the following properties:

(i) if $r_1 \leqslant r_2$, then $A_{r_1} \subseteq A_{r_2}$;
(ii) for all r_1, r_2, $A_{r_1} \cdot A_{r_2} \subseteq A_{r_1+r_2}$;
(iii) the union $\bigcup_{r \geqslant 0} A_r$ is dense in A.

As the case of the obstruction C^*-algebras will be particularly important for us, we introduce some shorthand notation for that case.

Definition 3.9. For an open subgroupoid G of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ and $s \geqslant 0$, define $A^s(G)$ to be the C^*-algebra $C^*_{L,0}(G; s)$. For each $r \in [0, \infty]$, define

$$A^s(G)_r := \{a \in \mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G; s] \mid a(t) \text{ has } \Gamma\text{-propagation at most } r \text{ for all } t\},$$

so in particular $A^s(G)_\infty := \mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G;s]$. In the special case that $G = \Gamma \ltimes X$, we omit it from the notation and just write A^s and A^s_r.

When convenient, we will consider all these C^*-algebras as faithfully represented on the Hilbert space

$$L^2([0,\infty), H_s) = L^2[0,\infty) \otimes \ell^2(Z_s) \otimes \ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma).$$

Lemma 3.10. *For any open subgroupoid G of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ and any $s \geqslant 0$, the subsets $(A^s(G)_r)_{r \geqslant 0}$ define a filtration of $A^s(G)$ in the sense of Definition 3.8.*

Proof. An element $a \in A^s(G)$ is in $A^s(G)_r$ if and only if it is in the dense $*$-subalgebra $\mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G;s]$ and if whenever (gx, g, x) is in $\mathrm{supp(a(t))}$ for some t, we have $|g| \leqslant r$. The filtration properties follows directly from this, the facts that $|gh| \leqslant |g||h|$ and $|g^{-1}| = |g|$, and Lemma 3.3. □

Our last goal in this section is to discuss what happens when we take products of elements from A^s_r and $A^s(G)$ for some G and r. Note first that analogously to the case of subgroups, one may build a subgroupoid generated by some $S \subseteq \Gamma \ltimes X$ by iteratively closing under taking compositions, inverses, and units in the sense of parts (i)-(iii) of Definition 3.4 above. From this, it is straightforward to check that if S is an open subset of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, then the subgroupoid it generates is also open: see [3, Lemma 5.2] for a proof.

Definition 3.11. Let $r \geqslant 0$ and G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$. The *expansion* of G by r, denoted G^{+r}, is the open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by

$$G \cup \{(gx, g, x) \mid |g| \leqslant r,\ x \in G^{(0)}\}.$$

We conclude this section with two basic lemmas.

Lemma 3.12. *Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, and $r, s \geqslant 0$. Then*

$$A^s(G) \cdot A^s_r \cup A^s_r \cdot A^s(G) \subseteq A^s(G^{+r}).$$

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 3.3. □

Lemma 3.13. *For any $r_1, r_2 \geqslant 0$ and open subgroupoid G, we have that $(G^{+r_1})^{+r_2} \subseteq G^{+(r_1+r_2)}$.*

Proof. Clearly $G^{+r_1} \subseteq G^{+(r_1+r_2)}$, so it suffices to show that if x is in the unit space of G^{+r_1} and $|g| \leqslant r_2$, then (gx, g, x) is in $G^{+(r_1+r_2)}$. Indeed, as x is in the unit space of G^{+r_1} there is $h \in \Gamma$ with $|h| \leqslant r_1$ and $hx \in G^{(0)}$. Hence (gx, gh^{-1}, hx) and (hx, h, x) are in $G^{+(r_1+r_2)}$ and we have

$$(gx, g, x) = (gx, gh^{-1}, hx)(hx, h, x) \in G^{+(r_1+r_2)}$$

as required. □

4. Controlled K-theory

In this section we will introduce the main general tool needed for the proof of Theorem 2.10: controlled K-theory.

Our treatment in this section is based on the detailed development given by Oyono-Oyono and the third author [12]. Our controlled K-theory groups are, however, both more general in some ways, and more specific in others, than those of [12]. We thus try to keep our exposition self-contained; in particular, we assume no background beyond the basics of C^*-algebra K-theory as covered for example in [18] or [21]. Throughout, we provide references to [12] for comparison purposes, and the reader is encouraged to look there for a broader picture of the theory.

We now define the controlled K-groups that we need. Compare [12, Section 1.2] for the following definition.

Definition 4.1. Let A be a C^*-algebra. A *quasi-projection* in A is an element p of A such that $p = p^*$ and $\|p^2 - p\| < 1/8$. If S is a self-adjoint subspace of A, write $M_n(S)$ for the matrices in $M_n(A)$ with all entries coming from S, and $P_n^{1/8}(S)$ for the collection of quasi-projections in $M_n(S)$.

Let $\chi = \chi_{(1/2,\infty]}$ be the characteristic function of $(1/2, \infty]$. Then χ is continuous on the spectrum of any quasi-projection, and thus there is a well-defined map

$$\kappa : P_n^{1/8}(S) \to P_n(A), \quad p \mapsto \chi(p),$$

where $P_n(A)$ denotes the projections in $M_n(A)$.

Remark 4.2. The choice of '1/8' in the above is not important: any number no larger than 1/4 would do just as well. In some arguments

in controlled K-theory, it is useful to allow the bound on the 'projection error' $\|p^2 - p\|$ to change; for this reason in [12, Section 1.2], what we have called a quasi-projection would be called a $(1/8)$-*projection*. We do not need this extra flexibility, so it is more convenient to just fix an absolute error bound throughout. Similar remarks apply to quasi-unitaries as introduced in Definition 4.4 below.

If A is a C^*-algebra we denote its unitization by $\widetilde{A}$. For a natural number n, let 1_n denote the unit of $M_n(\widetilde{A})$. For the following definition, compare [12, Section 1, particularly Definition 1.12].

Definition 4.3. Let A be a non-unital C^*-algebra, and let S be a self-adjoint subspace of A. Let $\widetilde{S}$ denote the subspace $S + \mathbb{C}1$ of $\widetilde{A}$.

Using the inclusions

$$P_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \ni p \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in P_{n+1}^{1/8}(\widetilde{S})$$

we may define the union

$$P_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}).$$

Let $C([0,1], \widetilde{S})$ denote the self-adjoint subspace of the C^*-algebra $C([0,1], \widetilde{A})$ consisting of functions with values in $\widetilde{S}$. Define an equivalence relation on $P_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \times \mathbb{N}$ by $(p,m) \sim (q,n)$ if there exists a positive integer k and an element h of $P_\infty^{1/8}(C([0,1], \widetilde{S}))$ such that

$$h(0) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{n+k} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad h(1) = \begin{pmatrix} q & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{m+k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $(p,m) \in P_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \times \mathbb{N}$, denote by $[p,m]$ its equivalence class under $\sim$.

Let now $\rho : M_n(\widetilde{S}) \to M_n(\mathbb{C})$ be the restriction to $M_n(\widetilde{S})$ of the map induced on matrices by the canonical unital $*$-homomorphism $\rho : \widetilde{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ with kernel A. Finally, define

$$K_0^{1/8}(S) := \{[p,m] \in \left(P_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \times \mathbb{N}\right) \,/\, \sim \mid \operatorname{rank}(\kappa(\rho(p))) = m\}.$$

The set $K_0^{1/8}(S)$ is equipped with an operation defined by

$$[p,m] + [q,n] := \left[\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & q \end{pmatrix} \,,\, m+n \right].$$

Using standard arguments in K-theory, one sees that $K_0^{1/8}(S)$ is an abelian group with unit $[0,0]$: compare [12, Lemmas 1.14 and 1.15].

We now look at controlled K_1 groups. Compare [12, Section 1.2] for the following definition.

Definition 4.4. Let A be a unital C^*-algebra. A *quasi-unitary* in A is an element u of A such that $\|1-uu^*\| < 1/8$ and $\|1-u^*u\| < 1/8$. If S is a self-adjoint subspace of A containing the unit, write $U_n^{1/8}(S)$ for the collection of quasi-unitaries in $M_n(S)$.

Note that as $\|1-u^*u\| < 1/8 < 1$, u^*u is invertible whence there is a well-defined map

$$\kappa : U_n^{1/8}(S) \to U_n(A),\ u \mapsto u(u^*u)^{-1/2},$$

where $U_n(A)$ denotes the unitaries in $M_n(A)$.

For the following definition, compare [12, Section 1, particularly Definition 1.12].

Definition 4.5. Let A be a non-unital C^*-algebra, and let S be a self-adjoint subspace of A. Let $\widetilde{A}$ denote the unitization of A and let $\widetilde{S}$ be the subspace $S + \mathbb{C}1$ of $\widetilde{A}$.

Using the inclusions

$$U_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \ni u \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in U_{n+1}^{1/8}(\widetilde{S})$$

we may define the union

$$U_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}).$$

Let $C([0,1],\widetilde{S})$ denote the self-adjoint subspace of the C^*-algebra $C([0,1],\widetilde{A})$ consisting of elements with values in $\widetilde{S}$. Define an equivalence relation on $U_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S})$ by $u \sim v$ if there exists an element h of $U_\infty^{1/8}(C([0,1],\widetilde{S}))$ such that $h(0) = u$ and $h(1) = v$. For $u \in U_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S})$, denote by $[u]$ its equivalence class under $\sim$.

Finally define

$$K_1^{1/8}(S) := U_\infty^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \,/\sim .$$

The set $K_1^{1/8}(S)$ is equipped with the operation defined by

$$[u] + [v] := \begin{bmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & v \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using standard arguments in K-theory, one sees that the operation on $K_1^{1/8}(S)$ makes it into an abelian monoid[1] with unit $[1]$: compare [12, Lemmas 1.14 and 1.16].

Definition 4.6. Let A be a C^*-algebra and S a self-adjoint subspace of A. Define

$$K_*^{1/8}(S) := K_0^{1/8}(S) \oplus K_1^{1/8}(S).$$

The (graded, unital, abelian) semigroup $K_*^{1/8}(S)$ is called the *controlled K-theory semigroup of S*.

Note that $K_*^{1/8}(S)$ depends on the embedding of S inside the ambient C^*-algebra A; which embedding is being used will always be obvious, however, so we omit it from the notation.

Remark 4.7. If $S \subseteq T$ are nested self-adjoint subspaces of a (non-unital) C^*-algebra A, then we may consider elements of matrix algebras over $\widetilde{S}$ as elements of matrix algebras over $\widetilde{T}$. This clearly gives rise to a map on controlled K-theory

$$K_*^{1/8}(S) \to K_*^{1/8}(T) \tag{4.1}$$

induced by the inclusion. To avoid clutter, we will not use specific notation for these inclusion maps; sometimes we refer to them as 'subspace-inclusion' maps. We also sometimes abuse terminology and say something like 'let x and y be elements of $K_*^{1/8}(S)$ that are equal in $K_*^{1/8}(T)$'; more precisely, this means that x and y are elements of $K_*^{1/8}(S)$ that go to the same element of $K_*^{1/8}(T)$ under the map in line (4.1) above.

For the next definition and lemma, which compares controlled K-theory to the usual K-theory groups of a C^*-algebra, compare [12, Remarks 1.17 and 1.18]. Let $K_*(A) := K_0(A) \oplus K_1(A)$ denote the usual (topological) K-theory group of a C^*-algebra A.

[1]The usual arguments showing $K_1(A)$ has inverses do not apply as they involve multiplying elements together, and so potentially go outside $\widetilde{S}$.

Definition 4.8. Let A be a non-unital C^*-algebra, and let S be a self-adjoint subspace of A. Let κ be one of the maps from Definition 4.1 and 4.4 (it will be obvious from context which is meant). Define maps

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 : K_0^{1/8}(S) &\to K_0(A),\ [p,m] \mapsto [\kappa(p)] - [1_m] \\ c_1 : K_1^{1/8}(S) &\to K_1(A),\ [u] \mapsto [\kappa(u)] \\ c := c_0 \oplus c_1 : K_*^{1/8}(S) &\to K_*(A). \end{aligned}$$

We call c_0, c_1, and c the *comparison maps*.

Standard arguments in C^*-algebra K-theory show that c_0, c_1 and c are well-defined unital semigroup homomorphisms. The map c is 'almost isomorphic' in the following sense.

Lemma 4.9. *Let A be a C^*-algebra. Let $(S_i)_{i\in I}$ be a collection of self-adjoint subspaces of A such that the union $\bigcup_{i\in I} S_i$ is dense. Then for any $x \in K_*(A)$ there exists S_i and $y \in K_*^{1/8}(S_i)$ such that $c(y) = x$.*

Assume moreover that the collection $(S_i)_{i\in I}$ is directed for the partial order given by inclusion. Then if $x, y \in K_*^{1/8}(S_i)$ are such that $c(x) = c(y)$ there exists S_j containing S_i such that x and y become equal in $K_*^{1/8}(S_j)$ in the sense of Remark 4.7.

In particular, if S is a dense self-adjoint subspace of A, then the comparison map $c : K_*^{1/8}(S) \to K_*(A)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We just look at the case of K_1: the K_0 case is similar. Let $[u]$ be a class in $K_1(A)$. As $\bigcup_i S_i$ is dense in A, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is an $i \in I$ and v in a matrix algebra over the unitization of S_i such that $\|u - v\| < \epsilon$. For ϵ suitably small, this implies that v is a quasi-unitary, and moreover that $\|\kappa(v) - u\| < 2$, whence $[\kappa(v)] = [u]$ in $K_1(A)$.

The injectivity statement follows on applying a similar argument to homotopies. Indeed, it suffices to show that any homotopy h in $C([0,1], M_n(\widetilde{A}))$ can be approximated by a homotopy in $C([0,1], M_n(\widetilde{S_i}))$ for some i. For this, note that density gives us elements $a_0, ..., a_m$ with a_k in some $M_n(\widetilde{S_{i_k}})$ such that the map $g : [0,1] \to A$ which sends k/m to a_k and linearly interpolates between these points is a good approximant to h. The directedness assumption implies there is some S_j that contains all of $S_{i_0}, ..., S_{i_m}$, so g is in $C([0,1], M_n(\widetilde{S_j}))$. □

The most important examples of subspaces we will use (particularly in the context of Lemma 4.9) come from filtrations as in Definition 3.8 (see Definition 3.9 and Lemma 3.10 for examples). It will be convenient to have some additional notation in the case when A is filtered.

Definition 4.10. Let A be a non-unital filtered C^*-algebra, and S be a self-adjoint subspace of A. For each $r \geqslant 0$ and $i \in \{0, 1, *\}$, define

$$K_i^{r,1/8}(S) := K_i^{1/8}(S \cap A_r).$$

Note that in the case that $S = A$, our notation agrees with that of [12, Section 1.3].

5. Strategy of proof of Theorem 2.10

In this short section, we set out our strategy for the proof of Theorem 2.10. Our goal is to reduce the proof to two technical propositions and show how finite dynamic asymptotic dimension can be used as an input for these. The two propositions will be proved in the next two sections.

Throughout this section, $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ is an action as usual, and we use the shorthand notations of Definition 3.9 for the obstruction C^*-algebras and their groupoid versions.

Here are the two technical propositions, which should be thought of as the base case and inductive step in the proof.

Proposition 5.1 (Base case)**.** *Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, and assume $s \geqslant 0$ is such that*

$$G \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}.$$

Then $K_*(A^s(G)) = 0$.

Proposition 5.2 (Inductive step)**.** *Let $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be an action. Let $r_0, s_0 \geqslant 0$, and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is $r \geqslant \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ that depends only on the given action, r_0, s_0 and d with the following property.*

Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ such that there are open subsets $U_0, ..., U_d$ of X with the following properties:

(i) the unit space $G^{(0)}$ equals $\bigcup_{i=0}^{d} U_i$;

(ii) for each $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, if G_i is the subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r} h \cdot U_i,\ |g| \leqslant r \right\},$$

then the expansion G_i^{+r} has compact closure.

Then for any $s \geqslant \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ with

$$\bigcup_{i=0}^{d} G_i^{+r} \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}$$

the subspace-inclusion map (cf. Remark 4.7)

$$K_*^{r_0, 1/8}(A^{s_0}(G)) \to K_*^{s, 1/8}(A^s(G^{+r}))$$

is the zero map.

In the remainder of this section, we show how these two propositions imply Theorem 2.10. The key dynamical input is the following.

Lemma 5.3. *Say $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ has dynamic asymptotic dimension d. Then for any $r \geqslant 0$ there is an open cover $\{U_0, ..., U_d\}$ of X such that for each $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, if G_i is the subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by*

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r} h \cdot U_i,\ |g| \leqslant r \right\},$$

then G_i^{+r} has compact closure.

Proof. Let $U_0, ..., U_d$ be a cover of X satisfying the property in Definition 1.3 with respect to the parameter $5r$ and some $s \geqslant 0$. Fix $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, and let G be the subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by the set

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r} h \cdot U_i,\ |g| \leqslant r \right\}$$

in the statement. We claim that

$$G^{+r} \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s + 4r\};$$

as the set on the right is compact, this will suffice to complete the proof.

To see this, let (gx, g, x) be an element of G, so we may write

$$(gx, g, x) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} (g_k \cdots g_1 g_0 x \ , \ g_k \ , \ g_{k-1} \cdots g_1 g_0 x)$$

where g_0 is the identity, each g_k satisfies $|g_k| \leqslant r$, and where for each $k \in \{1, ..., n\}$ at least one of $g_k \cdots g_1 x$ or $g_{k-1} \cdots g_1 x$ is in $\bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r} h \cdot U_i$. For each $k \in \{0, ..., n\}$, we may therefore choose h_k with $|h_k| \leqslant 2r$ and $y_k \in U_i$ such that $g_k \cdots g_1 g_0 x = h_k y_k$. Then for each $k \in \{1, ..., n\}$ we have

$$(g_k \cdots g_1 g_0 x, g_k, g_{k-1} \cdots g_0 x) = (h_k y_k, h_k g_k h_{k-1}^{-1}, h_{k-1} y_{k-1}).$$

As $|h_k g_k h_{k-1}^{-1}| \leqslant 5r$ and the elements $h_k y_k$ are in U_i, Definition 1.2 gives us that the product

$$(h_n g_n h_{n-1}^{-1})(h_{n-1} g_{n-1} h_{n-2}) \cdots (h_1 g_1 h_0^{-1})$$

has length at most s, or in other words, $|h_n g_n \cdots g_1 h_0^{-1}| \leqslant s$. As $|h_n|$ and $|h_0|$ are both at most $2r$, this completes the proof of the claim, and so the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.10. We need to show that for any $s_0 \geqslant 0$ and any class $x \in K_*(A^{s_0})$ there is $s \geqslant s_0$ such that the subspace-inclusion map

$$K_*(A^{s_0}) \to K_*(A^s)$$

sends x to zero. Lemma 4.9 implies that there is $r_0 \geqslant 0$ such that x is in the image of the comparison map $c : K_*^{r_0, 1/8}(A^{s_0}) \to K_*(A^{s_0})$ from Definition 4.8. Proposition 5.2 applied to $G = \Gamma \ltimes X$ and Lemma 5.3 together imply that there is $s \geqslant \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ such that the subspace-inclusion map

$$K_*^{r_0, 1/8}(A^{s_0}) \to K_*^{s, 1/8}(A^s)$$

is zero. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_*(A^{s_0}) & \longrightarrow & K_*(A^s) \\ {\scriptstyle c}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle c} \\ K_*^{r_0, 1/8}(A^{s_0}) & \longrightarrow & K_*^{s, 1/8}(A^s) \ , \end{array}$$

where the two horizontal arrows are induced by subspace inclusions, and the two vertical arrows are comparison maps; it is clear from the definition of the comparison maps that it commutes. We have that the element $x \in K_*(A^{s_0})$ is in the image of the left comparison map c, and

that the bottom horizontal map is zero. Hence the image of x under the top horizontal map is zero as claimed. □

6. Base of the induction

In this section, we prove Proposition 5.1, which we repeat below for the reader's convenience.

Proposition. *Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, and assume $s \geqslant 0$ is such that*

$$G \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}.$$

Then $K_*(A^s(G)) = 0$.

The proof is based on a technique of the third author: see for example [24, Lemma 4.8]. The K-theory of the localization algebra is an (equivariant) generalized homology theory in an appropriate sense, and the point of the proof is to show that this homology theory is homotopy invariant. Having done this, the condition on s in the statement is enough to ensure the relevant space becomes contractible, from which the result follows.

To try to make the proof more palatable, we will separate it into two parts. The first is purely K-theoretic: it gives a sufficient condition for two $*$-homomorphisms to induce the same map on K-theory. The second part uses the underlying dynamics to build an input to this K-theoretic machine, and completes the proof.

K-theoretic part. We start the K-theoretic part with three basic K-theory lemmas. Recall first that if A is a C^*-algebra, represented faithfully and non-degenerately on a Hilbert space H, then the *multiplier algebra* of A is

$$M(A) := \{b \in \mathcal{B}(H) \mid ba,\ ab \in A \text{ for all } a \in A\};$$

it is a C^*-algebra. The *strict topology* on $M(A)$ is the topology generated by the seminorms

$$a \mapsto \|ba\|, \quad a \mapsto \|ab\|$$

as b ranges over A. The multiplier algebra and strict topology do not depend on the choice of H up to canonical isomorphism: see for example [14, Section 3.12].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\alpha : A \to C$ be a $*$-homomorphism of C^*-algebras, and v a partial isometry in the multiplier algebra of C such that $\alpha(a)v^*v = \alpha(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Then the map*

$$a \mapsto v\alpha(a)v^*$$

is a $*$-homomorphism from A to C, and induces the same map as α on the level of K-theory.

Proof. See for example [7, Lemma 2 in Section 3]. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let I be an ideal in a unital C^*-algebra C, and define the* double *of C along I to be the C^*-algebra*

$$D := \{(c_1, c_2) \in C \oplus C \mid c_1 - c_2 \in I\}.$$

Assume that C has trivial K-theory. Then the inclusion $\iota : I \to D$ defined by $c \mapsto (c, 0)$ induces an isomorphism on K-theory, and the inclusion $\kappa : I \to D$ defined by $c \mapsto (c, c)$ induces the zero map on K-theory.

Proof. Note that $\iota(I)$ is an ideal in D, and $D/\iota(I)$ is isomorphic to C via the second coordinate projection. Hence ι is an isomorphism by the six-term exact sequence. On the other hand, κ factors through the inclusion $C \to D$ defined by the same formula $c \mapsto (c, c)$, and thus $\kappa_* = 0$ on K-theory as $K_*(C) = 0$. □

Lemma 6.3. *Say $\alpha, \beta : C \to D$ are $*$-homomorphisms between C^*-algebras with orthogonal images (this means that $\alpha(c_1)\beta(c_2) = 0$ for all $c_1, c_2 \in C$).*

Then $\alpha + \beta$ is a $*$-homomorphism from C to D, and as maps on K-theory $\alpha_* + \beta_* = (\alpha + \beta)_*$.

Proof. Orthogonality of the images of α and β directly implies that $\alpha + \beta$ is a $*$-homomorphism. For $t \in [0, \pi/2]$, consider the map $\gamma_t : C \to M_2(D)$ defined by

$$c \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(c) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \cos(t) & \sin(t) \\ -\sin(t) & \cos(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta(c) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos(t) & -\sin(t) \\ \sin(t) & \cos(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

One directly checks that this is a homotopy of $*$-homomorphisms. Moreover, identifying $K_*(D)$ with $K_*(M_2(D))$ in the canonical way via the top-left-corner inclusion $D \to M_2(D)$, it is straightforward to check that $(\gamma_0)_* = \alpha_* + \beta_*$ and $(\gamma_1)_* = (\alpha + \beta)_*$. □

Before getting to the main result, we need one more preliminary, this time mainly C^*-algebraic. First, a definition.

Definition 6.4. A *stability structure* for A is a sequence of isometries $(u_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ in $M(A)$ such that $u_n^* u_m = 0$ for $n \neq m$, and such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n u_n^*$$

converges strictly to the identity of $M(A)$.

Note that a stable C^*-algebra has a stability structure in a natural way: this is the motivation for the terminology.

Lemma 6.5. *Let A have a stability structure as in Definition 6.4. Then for any bounded sequence (a_n) in $M(A)$, the sum*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n a_n u_n^*$$

converges strictly to an element of $M(A)$. Moreover, the sum

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_{n+1} u_n^*$$

converges strictly to an isometry of $M(A)$. Finally, $K_*(M(A)) = 0$.

Proof. Let b be an element of A. For any $N \geqslant M$ note that

$$\Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_n a_n u_n^* b \Big)^* \Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_n a_n u_n^* b \Big) = \sum_{n=M}^{N} b^* u_n a_n^* a_n u_n^* b \leqslant \|a_n^* a_n\| \sum_{n=M}^{N} b^* u_n u_n^* b$$
$$\leqslant (\sup_n \|a_n\|^2) b^* \Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_n u_n^* \Big) b.$$

Strict convergence of $\sum u_n u_n^*$ implies the above tends to zero in norm as N, M tend to infinity. Hence by the C^*-identity the sequence of partial sums $(\sum_{n=0}^{N} u_n a_n u_n^* b)_{N=0}^{\infty}$ is (norm) Cauchy, and thus convergent. A

similar computation shows that the partial sums $(b\sum_{n=0}^{N} u_n a_n u_n^*)_{N=0}^{\infty}$ are norm convergent for any $b \in A$, which gives the strict convergence.

Similarly, note that for $b \in A$

$$\Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_{n+1}u_n^* b\Big)^*\Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_{n+1}u_n^* b\Big) = b^*\Big(\sum_{n=M}^{N} u_n u_n^*\Big)b,$$

whence again the sequence of partial sums $(\sum_{n=0}^{N} u_{n+1}u_n^* b)_{N=0}^{\infty}$ is (norm) Cauchy, and thus convergent. Similarly, $(\sum_{n=0}^{N} b u_{n+1}u_n^*)_{N=0}^{\infty}$ is norm convergent. We thus have that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_{n+1}u_n^*$ is strictly convergent, and a direct computation shows that it is an isometry.

For the K-theoretic statement, note that

$$\mu : M(A) \to M(A), \quad a \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n a u_n^*$$

is a $*$-homomorphism. Let

$$v = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_{n+1}u_n^*,$$

which is an isometry in $M(A)$ by the above. Using Lemma 6.1, μ induces the same map on K-theory as the map $a \mapsto v\mu(a)v^*$, i.e. as

$$\mu^{+1}(a) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n a u_n^*.$$

Let $\mu^0(a) = u_0 a u_0^*$. Then the images of μ^0 and μ^{+1} are orthogonal, and clearly $\mu^0 + \mu^{+1} = \mu$, whence by Lemma 6.3 as maps on K-theory

$$\mu_* = \mu_*^0 + \mu_*^{+1} = \mu_*^0 + \mu_*.$$

Hence $\mu_*^0 = 0$. However, by Lemma 6.1 again, μ_*^0 is the identity map on $K_*(M(A))$. □

Definition 6.6. Let A be a C^*-algebra which is faithfully and non-degenerately represented on a Hilbert space H, and which is equipped with a stability structure (u_n) as in Lemma 6.5.

Let v_0 and v_∞ be isometries on H that conjugate A to itself. We say that v_0 and v_∞ are *stably equivalent* if there are in addition isometries $(v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ on H that conjugate A into itself and that satisfy:

(i) for any a in A, the difference
$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_n a v_n^* u_n^* - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^*$$
is in A;

(ii) for all $0 \leqslant n \leqslant \infty$, $v_{n+1} v_n^*$ is in $M(A)$ (where $\infty + 1 = \infty$) and for all $a \in A$
$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n a (v_\infty v_\infty^* - v_{n+1} v_n^*) u_n^* \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n (v_\infty v_\infty^* - v_{n+1} v_n^*) a u_n^*$$
are in A.

To clarify these conditions note that Lemma 6.5 implies that the sums in the displayed lines all converge strictly to elements of the multiplier algebra of A; the extra condition is that the sums are actually in A. For readers who know the terminology, compare condition (i) above to the definition of a quasi-morphism in the sense of Cuntz [2, Section 17.6].

Here finally is the main K-theoretic ingredient we need.

Proposition 6.7. *Let A be C^*-algebra faithfully represented on a Hilbert space H, and let v_0 and v_∞ be stably equivalent isometries for this representation. Then the homomorphisms*
$$\phi_0, \phi_\infty : A \to A$$
induced by conjugation by v_0 and v_∞ induce the same map on K-theory.

Proof. Let
$$D := \{(a, b) \in M(A) \oplus M(A) \mid a - b \in A\}$$
be the double of $M(A)$ along A as in Lemma 6.2. Note that Lemma 6.5 implies that $K_*(M(A)) = 0$, so we may apply the conclusions of Lemma 6.2 to D. Let
$$C = \Big\{(c, d) \in D \mid d = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^* \text{ for some } a \in A\Big\},$$
which is a C^*-subalgebra of D. Define also
$$w_1 := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_{n+1} v_n^* u_n^*, \quad w_2 := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty v_\infty^* u_n^*$$

(which are elements of $M(A)$ by Lemma 6.5) and set $w := (w_1, w_2) \in M(A) \oplus M(A)$. We claim that w is actually in the multiplier algebra of C.

Indeed, if (c, d) is in C, then $dw_2 = w_2 d = d$, so it suffices to show that $cw_1 - d$ and $w_1 c - d$ are in A; we focus on $w_1 c - d$, the other case being similar. We have

$$w_1 c - d = w_1(c - d) + (w_1 d - d),$$

whence as $c - d \in A$ and $w_1 \in M(A)$, it suffices to show that $w_1 d - d$ is in A. There exists $a \in A$ with

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 d - d &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n (v_{n+1} v_n^* v_\infty a v_\infty^* - v_\infty a v_\infty^*) u_n^* \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n (v_{n+1} v_n^* - v_\infty v_\infty^*) v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^*, \end{aligned}$$

and this is in A by condition (ii) of Definition 6.6, completing the proof of the claim.

Now, provisionally define $*$-homomorphisms

$$\alpha, \beta : A \to D$$

by the formulas

$$\alpha(a) := \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_n a v_n^* u_n^* \ , \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^* \right)$$

and

$$\beta(a) := \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_{n+1} a v_{n+1}^* u_n^* \ , \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^* \right).$$

It is clear from our assumptions that these formulas define $*$-homomorphisms $\alpha, \beta : A \to M(A) \oplus M(A)$ and that the image of α is in $C \subseteq D$. That β has image in C follows as w is in the multiplier algebra of C, and as $w\alpha(a)w^* = \beta(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Moreover, a direct computation gives that $\alpha(a)w^*w = \alpha(a)$, whence α and β induce the same map $K_*(A) \to K_*(C)$ by Lemma 6.1. Post-composing with the map $K_*(C) \to K_*(D)$ induced by the inclusion of C into D, it follows that α and β induce the same map $K_*(A) \to K_*(D)$.

Let now $u = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_{n+1} u_n^* \in M(A)$ be the isometry from Lemma 6.5. Then (u, u) is a multiplier of D; conjugating by (u, u) and applying

Lemma 6.1 shows that β induces the same map $K_*(A) \to K_*(D)$ as the $*$-homomorphism $\gamma : A \to D$ defined by

$$\gamma(a) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n v_n a v_n^* u_n^* \ , \ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^* \right).$$

On the other hand, the $*$-homomorphism $\delta : A \to D$ defined by

$$\delta : a \mapsto (u_0 v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_0^* \ , \ u_0 v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_0^*)$$

induces the zero map on K-theory (by Lemma 6.2) and has orthogonal image to γ. Hence from Lemma 6.3 the sum $\epsilon := \gamma + \delta$ is a well-defined $*$-homomorphism that induces the same map on K-theory as β.

Compiling our discussion so far, we have

$$\alpha_* = \beta_* = \gamma_* = \gamma_* + \delta_* = \epsilon_* \tag{6.1}$$

as maps $K_*(A) \to K_*(D)$. Let $\psi_0, \psi_\infty : A \to D$ be the $*$-homomorphisms defined by

$$\psi_0 : a \mapsto (u_0 v_0 a v_0^* u_0^*, 0), \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\infty : a \mapsto (u_0 v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_0^*, 0),$$

and define $\zeta : A \to D$ by

$$\zeta(a) := \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n v_n a v_n^* u_n^* \ , \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^* \right).$$

Note that ζ has orthogonal image to ψ_0 and ψ_∞, and that

$$\psi_0 + \zeta = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_\infty + \zeta = \epsilon;$$

hence from Lemma 6.3 and line (6.1),

$$(\psi_0)_* + \zeta_* = \alpha_* = \epsilon_* = (\psi_\infty)_* + \zeta_*.$$

Cancelling ζ_* thus gives that ψ_0 and ψ_∞ induce the same maps on K-theory.

Finally, note that if $\iota : A \to D$ is the map of Lemma 6.2, then

$$\psi_i(a) = u_0 \iota(\phi_i(a)) u_0^*$$

for all $a \in A$ and $i \in \{0, \infty\}$. This implies the desired result as Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 show that conjugation of D by (u_0, u_0) and $\iota : A \to D$ both induce isomorphisms on K-theory. $\square$

Dynamical part. We now provide the dynamical input for Proposition 6.7 needed to complete the proof of Proposition 5.1. Recall that we want to show that $K_*(A^s(G))$ is zero whenever the open subgroupoid G of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ and number $s \geqslant 0$ satisfy

$$G \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}. \tag{6.2}$$

For the remainder of the section, fix s and G satisfying these hypotheses.

We will start by building a convenient representation of the C^*-algebra $A^s(G)$. For $z \in P_s(\Gamma)$, recall from Definition 3.2 that $\mathrm{supp}(z)$ consists of those $g \in \Gamma$ spanning the minimal simplex containing z, and define

$$P_s(G) := \{(z, x) \in P_s(\Gamma) \times X \mid (gx, g, x) \in G \text{ for all } g \in \mathrm{supp}(z)\}.$$

Recall from Definition 2.2 that Z_s is our fixed dense subset of $P_s(\Gamma)$. Define $Z_G := (Z_s \times X) \cap P_s(G)$ and

$$H_G := \ell^2(Z_G, H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)) = \ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$$

which is a subspace of $H_s = \ell^2(Z_s \times X, H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma))$ as described in line (2.2) above. We have the following lemma; the proof involves essentially the same computations as Lemma 3.3 above, and is thus omitted.

Lemma 6.8. *The faithful representation of $C^*(G; s)$ on H_s restricts to a faithful representation on H_G.* □

For the remainder of this section, we will consider $C^*(G; s)$ as faithfully represented on H_G, and $A^s(G) := C^*_{L,0}(G; s)$ as faithfully represented on $L^2([0, \infty), H_G)$ in the obvious way.

Now, the assumption in line (6.2) implies that if $(z, x) \in P_s(G)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(z) = \{g_1, ..., g_n\}$, then $\{e, g_1, ..., g_n\}$ also spans a simplex Δ in $P_s(\Gamma)$ such that $\Delta \times \{x\}$ is contained in $P_s(G)$. Hence the family of functions

$$H_r : P_s(G) \to P_s(G), \quad (z, x) \mapsto ((1 - r)z + re, x), \quad 0 \leqslant r \leqslant 1$$

defines a homotopy between the identity map on $P_s(G)$ and the obvious projection onto the subset $\{(z, x) \in P_s(G) \mid z = e\}$, which is just a copy of the unit space $G^{(0)}$.

Let $\pi : Z_G \to Z_s$ denote the projection onto the first coordinate, and let Z denote the image of π. Note that Z is countable, whence as H is infinite dimensional we may find a family $\{w_{z,0}\}_{z\in Z}$ of isometries on H such that $\sum_{z\in Z} w_{z,0}w_{z,0}^*$ converges strongly to the identity. For each $z \in Z$, let $w_z : H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma) \to H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$ be the isometry defined by $w_z := w_{z,0} \otimes 1_{\ell^2(\Gamma)}$.

Now, for each $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ define

$$w(r) : \ell^2(Z_G)\otimes H\otimes\ell^2(\Gamma) \to \ell^2(Z_G)\otimes H\otimes\ell^2(\Gamma), \quad \delta_{z,x}\otimes\eta \mapsto \delta_{(1-r)z+re,x}\otimes w_z\eta$$

which is a well-defined isometry by definition of Z_s (Definition 2.2 above) and of Z_G. For each $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ (we assume $\mathbb{N}$ includes zero), define an isometry

$$v_n(t) : \ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma) \to \ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$$

by the following prescriptions:

(i) for $t < n$, $v_n(t) := w(0)$ (and in particular $v_\infty(t) = w(0)$ for all t);
(ii) for $m \in [n, 2n) \cap \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [m, m + 1)$, $(z, x) \in Z_G$ with $z \neq e$, and $\eta \in H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$,

$$v_n(t)(\delta_{z,x} \otimes \eta) := \left(\left|\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(t-m)\right)\right| w\left(\frac{m-n}{n}\right) + \left|\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(t-m)\right)\right| w\left(\frac{m+1-n}{n}\right)\right)(\delta_{z,x} \otimes \eta);$$

(iii) for $t \in [n, 2n)$, $(e, x) \in Z_G$, and $\eta \in H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$

$$v_n(t)(\delta_{e,x} \otimes \eta) := \delta_{e,x} \otimes w_e\eta;$$

(iv) for $t \geqslant 2n$, $v_n(t) := w(1)$.

It is not difficult to check that the map

$$[0, \infty) \to \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)), \quad t \mapsto v_n(t)$$

is norm continuous for each n (and in fact, the family is equicontinuous as n varies), and that the image consists entirely of isometries. The following schematic may help to visualize the operators $v_n(t)$.



Here $v_n(t)$ is constantly equal to $w(0)$ in the left triangular region, and constantly equal to $w(1)$ in the right triangular region. Along each of the horizontal arrows in the intermediate region, $v_n(t)$ interpolates between $w(0)$ and $w(1)$, taking longer and longer to do so as n increases.

We are now ready to construct isometries as demanded by the definition of stable equivalence. Define an isometry

$$v_n : L^2([0,\infty), H_G) \to L^2([0,\infty), H_G)$$

for each n by for each $\xi \in L^2([0,\infty), H_G)$ defining

$$(v_n\xi)(t) := v_n(t)(\xi(t)).$$

On the other hand, choose a unitary isomorphism

$$H \cong \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H$$

and use this to define isometries $u_{n,0} : H \to H$ with mutually orthogonal ranges such that the sum $\sum u_{n,0}u_{n,0}^*$ converges strongly to the identity operator. Define u_n to be the isometry on

$$L^2([0,\infty), H_G) = L^2[0,\infty) \otimes \ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$$

induced by tensoring $u_{n,0}$ with the identity on the other factors.

Lemma 6.9. *With notation as above, the isometries v_0 and v_∞ are stably equivalent with respect to the C^*-algebra $A^s(G)$.*

Proof. It is clear that the sequence of isometries (u_n) defines a stability structure on $A^s(G)$. Let a be an element of $\mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G; s]$, and let $T = a(t)$ for some fixed $t \in [0,\infty)$. The matrix entries $(v_n(t)Tv_n(t)^*)_{y,z}(x)$ of

$v_n(t)Tv_n(t)^*$ will then be a linear combination of at most four terms of the form

$$w_z^* T_{H_{r_1}(y),H_{r_2}(z)}(x) w_y^*$$

where r_1 and r_2 are in $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0,1]$, and $|r_1 - r_2| < 1/m$ whenever $t > 2m$. From this description, it is straightforward to check that the Rips-propagation of $v_n(t)a(t)v_n(t)^*$ is at most the Rips-propagation of $a(t)$ plus $\min\{1, 2/(t-1)\}$; and (therefore) that $v_n a v_n^*$ is in $\mathbb{C}_{L,0}[G; s]$.

To see that $v_{n+1}v_n^*$ is a multiplier of $A^s(G)$, note that the operators $S_t := v_{n+1}(t)v_n(t)^*$ on $\ell^2(Z_G) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$ have matrix entries $(S_t)_{y,z}$ that act as constant functions $X \to \mathcal{B}(H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma))$; that their Rips-propagation tends to zero as t tends to infinity; and that they have Γ-propagation at most s for all t.

Finally, the fact that the operators

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_n a v_n^* u_n^* - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n v_\infty a v_\infty^* u_n^*,$$

as well as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n a (v_\infty v_\infty^* - v_{n+1} v_n^*) u_n^* \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n (v_\infty v_\infty^* - v_{n+1} v_n^*) a u_n^*$$

are in $A^s(G)$ for all $a \in A^s(G)$ follows as for any fixed t and all $n > t$, $v_n(t) = v_\infty(t)$. □

Let now

$$\phi_0, \phi_\infty : K_*(A^s(G)) \to K_*(A^s(G))$$

be the maps induced on K-theory by conjugation by v_0 and by v_∞. Proposition 6.7 and Lemma 6.9 imply that these are the same map. The following two lemmas will now complete the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 6.10. *The map*

$$\phi_\infty : K_*(A^s(G)) \to K_*(A^s(G))$$

constructed above is the identity map.

Proof. The map ϕ_∞ is given by conjugation by the isometry $w(0)$ (constantly in the 'localization variable' t), which is in the multiplier algebra of $A^s(G)$. Hence it induces the identity on K-theory by Lemma 6.1. □

Lemma 6.11. *The map*

$$\phi_0 : K_*(A^s(G)) \to K_*(A^s(G))$$

constructed above is the zero map.

Proof. Let $G^{(0)}$ be the unit space of G, which is an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$, and thus $A^s(G^{(0)})$ makes sense. It is straightforward to check that ϕ_0 fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_*(A^s(G)) & \xrightarrow{\quad\phi_0\quad} & K_*(A^s(G)) \\ & \searrow \quad \nearrow & \\ & K_*(A^s(G^{(0)})) & \end{array},$$

whence it suffices to show that $K_*(A^s(G^{(0)})) = 0$.

Let $u_n : L^2([0,\infty), H_G) \to L^2([0,\infty), H_G)$ be the isometries constructed above. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and element a of $A^s(G^{(0)})$, define $a^{(n)}$ to be the function

$$a^{(n)}(t) = \begin{cases} a(t-n) & t \geqslant n \\ 0 & t < n \end{cases}$$

in $A^s(G^{(0)})$. Define

$$\alpha : A^s(G^{(0)}) \to A^s(G^{(0)}),\ a \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n a^{(n)} u_n^*.$$

As every element of $A_F(Y)$ has zero Rips-propagation and satisfies $a(0) = 0$, α is a well-defined $*$-homomorphism. It thus induces a map on K-theory

$$\alpha_* : K_*(A^s(G^{(0)})) \to K_*(A^s(G^{(0)})).$$

However, if $\iota : A^s(G^{(0)}) \to A^s(G^{(0)})$ is the identity map, then a straightforward homotopy (using uniform continuity of each element of $A^s(Y)$) shows that $\alpha_* + \iota_* = \alpha_*$ and we are done. □

7. Inductive step

In this section, we prove Proposition 5.2, which we repeat below for the reader's convenience.

Proposition (Inductive step)**.** *Let $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$ be an action. Let $r_0, s_0 \geqslant 0$, and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is $r \geqslant \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ that depends only on the given action, r_0, s_0 and d with the following property.*

Let G be an open subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ such that there are open subsets $U_0, ..., U_d$ of X with the following properties:

(i) the unit space $G^{(0)}$ equals $\bigcup_{i=0}^{d} U_i$;
(ii) for each $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, if G_i is the subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r} h \cdot U_i,\ |g| \leqslant r \right\},$$

then the expansion G_i^{+r} has compact closure.

Then for any $s \geqslant \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ with

$$\bigcup_{i=0}^{d} G_i^{+r} \subseteq \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}$$

the subspace-inclusion map (cf. Remark 4.7)

$$K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G)) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G^{+r}))$$

is the zero map.

As in Section 6, we first build an abstract K-theoretic machine, and then use the dynamical assumptions to produce ingredients for that machine.

K-theoretic part. We start with a technical lemma about when elements are zero in the controlled setting: compare [12, Section 1.6]. The proof is in large part the same as that of [12, Proposition 1.31], but as our set up and precise statement are a little different, and to keep things self-contained, we give a complete proof here.

Before stating the lemma, we recall some notation from Section 4, and introduce some more. Let A be a non-unital C^*-algebra and $S \subseteq A$ a self-adjoint subspace. Let $\widetilde{A}$ be the unitization of A, and let $\widetilde{S}$ be the subspace of $\widetilde{A}$ spanned by S and the unit. Then

$$\kappa : P_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \to P_n(\widetilde{A}), \quad p \mapsto \chi_{(1/2,\infty]}(p)$$

is the map from quasi-projections in $M_n(\widetilde{S})$ to projections in $M_n(\widetilde{A})$ of Definition 4.1. Similarly,

$$\kappa : U_n^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \to U_n(\widetilde{A}), \quad u \mapsto u(u^*u)^{-1/2}$$

is the map from quasi-unitaries in $M_n(\widetilde{S})$ to unitaries in $M_n(\widetilde{A})$ of Definition 4.4. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\widetilde{S}^m := \mathrm{span}\{a_1 \cdots a_m \in A \mid a_i \in \widetilde{S} \text{ for all } i \in \{1, ..., m\}\}.$$

We will also need some notation for standard matrices. Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we will write '1_m' for the $m \times m$ identity matrix and '0_m' for the $m \times m$ zero matrix. We will adopt the shorthand '$\mathrm{diag}(\cdots)$' for a diagonal matrix with given entries: for example

$$\mathrm{diag}(a, b, 0) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 7.1. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there are constants $L(\epsilon) \geqslant 0$ and $M(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Let A be a non-unital C^*-algebra and $S \subseteq A$ a self-adjoint subspace.*

(i) Say $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(p, n) \in P_l^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \times \mathbb{N}$ is such that the class $[p, n]$ is zero in $K_0^{1/8}(S)$. Then there exist $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a homotopy $h : [0, 1] \to P_{l+k_1+k_2}(\widetilde{A})$ with

$$h(0) = \mathit{diag}(0_{k_1}, \kappa(p), 1_{k_2}) \quad \text{and} \quad h(1) = \mathit{diag}(0_{k_1}, 0_{l-n}, 1_{n+k_2}),$$

such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ with associated constants $L = L(\epsilon)$, $M = M(\epsilon)$, there is an L-Lipschitz map $h_\epsilon : [0, 1] \to M_{l+k_1+k_2}(\widetilde{S}^M)$ with

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|h_\epsilon(t) - h(t)\| < \epsilon.$$

(ii) Say $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and $u \in U_l^{1/8}(\widetilde{S})$ is such that the class $[u]$ is zero in $K_1^{1/8}(S)$. Then there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a homotopy $h : [0, 1] \to U_{l+k}(\widetilde{A})$ with

$$h(0) = \mathit{diag}(\kappa(u), 1_k) \quad \text{and} \quad h(1) = (1_l, 1_k)$$

such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ with associated constants $L = L(\epsilon)$, $M = M(\epsilon)$, there is an L-Lipschitz map $h_\epsilon : [0, 1] \to M_{l+k}(\widetilde{S}^M)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|h_\epsilon(t) - h(t)\| < \epsilon.$$

To summarize the idea, if an element of $K_*^{1/8}(S)$ is zero, then the fact that its image under the comparison map $c : K_*^{1/8}(S) \to K_*(A)$ is zero can be witnessed by a homotopy that is well-controlled, both with respect to how fast it goes, and with respect to the subspace of $M_\infty(\widetilde{A})$ it passes through.

Proof. We look first at the case of K_0. Let $(p, n) \in P_l^{1/8}(\widetilde{S}) \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, so there exist $j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a homotopy $\{p_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $P_{l+j_1+j_2}^{1/8}(C([0,1], \widetilde{S}))$ such that

$$p_0 = \mathrm{diag}(p, 0_{j_1}, 1_{j_2}) \quad \text{and} \quad p_1 = \mathrm{diag}(0_l, 0_{j_1}, 1_{j_2}).$$

As $[0, 1]$ is compact, there are $0 = t_0 < \cdots < t_N = 1$ such that

$$\|p_{t_i} - p_{t_{i-1}}\| < 1/12 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, ..., N\}. \tag{7.1}$$

Set $m = j_1 + j_2 + l$. We will first define a Lipschitz homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_{mN}, 0_{mN}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(0_{mN}, p_1, 1_{mN})$$

by concatenating the steps below.

(i) Perform a rotation homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_{mN}, 0_{mN}) \text{ and } \mathrm{diag}(p_0, \underbrace{1_m, 0_m, ..., 1_m, 0_m}_{N \text{ copies of } (1_m, 0_m)});$$

(ii) Let

$$r(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\pi t/2) & -\sin(\pi t/2) \\ \sin(\pi t/2) & \cos(\pi t/2) \end{pmatrix} \in M_{2m}(\mathbb{C}),$$

where each entry represents the corresponding scalar times 1_m. For $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$, in the i^{th} 'block' $\mathrm{diag}(1_m, 0_m)$ appearing in the above apply the homotopy

$$t \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1_m - p_{t_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + r(t) \begin{pmatrix} p_{t_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} r(t)^*$$

between $\mathrm{diag}(1_m, 0_m)$ and $\mathrm{diag}(p_{t_i}, 1 - p_{t_i})$ to get a homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_m, 0_m, ..., 1_m, 0_m)$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_m - p_{t_1}, p_{t_1}, 1_m - p_{t_2}, p_{t_2}, ..., 1 - p_{t_N}, p_{t_N}).$$

(iii) For each $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$, use a straight line homotopy between $1_m - p_{t_i}$ and $1_m - p_{t_{i-1}}$ in each appropriate entry to build a homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_m - p_{t_1}, p_{t_1}, 1_m - p_{t_2}, p_{t_2}, ..., 1 - p_{t_N}, p_{t_N})$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_m - p_{t_0}, p_{t_1}, 1_m - p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, ..., 1 - p_{t_{N-1}}, p_{t_N}).$$

(iv) Using a similar homotopy to step (ii), build a homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(p_0, 1_m - p_{t_0}, p_{t_1}, 1_m - p_{t_1}, p_{t_2}, ..., 1 - p_{t_{N-1}}, p_{t_N})$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(0_m, 1_m, ..., 0_m, 1_m, p_{t_N}).$$

(v) Finally, recall that $p_{t_N} = p_1$ and use another rotation homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(0_m, 1_m, ..., 0_m, 1_m, p_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(0_{mN}, p_1, 1_{mN})$$

to complete the proof of the claim.

Write $\{q_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ for the homotopy arrived at by concatenating the steps above; it is straightforward to check that this homotopy is Lipschitz for some universal Lipschitz constant. Note also that all of the matrices from steps (i)-(v) above have entries from $\widetilde{S}$, so this homotopy has image in $M_{m(2N+1)}(\widetilde{S})$.

We claim that $\|q_t^2 - q_t\| < 5/24$ for all t. Indeed, for all t associated to steps (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) we clearly have that $\|q_t^2 - q_t\| < 1/8$, so the only thing to be checked is the straight line homotopy in step (iii). For this, using the bound in line (7.1) it suffices to show that if p, q are two quasi-projections with $\|p - q\| < 1/12$, then for any $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\|((1-t)p + tq)^2 - ((1-t)p + tq)\| < 5/24.$$

Computing,

$$\begin{aligned}&((1-t)p + tq)^2 - ((1-t)p + tq)\\ &= (1-t)(p^2 - p) + (1-t)tp(p-q) + (1-t)tq(q-p) + t(q^2 - q).\end{aligned}$$

As $\|p\|$ and $\|q\|$ are both bounded above by 2, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\|((1-t)p + tq)^2 - ((1-t)p + tq)\|\\ &\quad < (1-t)(1/8) + t(1-t)(1/6) + t(1-t)(1/6) + t(1/8)\\ &\quad \leqslant 1/8 + 2/24 = 5/24\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Hence the spectrum of every q_t is bounded away from $1/2$, and thus defining $h(t) := \kappa(q_t)$ makes sense. Fix a sequence of real-valued polynomials (f_i) converging uniformly to $\chi_{(1/2,\infty]}$ on the spectrum of every q_t. As f_i is a polynomial and $t \mapsto q_t$ is Lipschitz and bounded, $t \mapsto f_i(q_t)$ is Lipschitz for each i, with some Lipschitz constant depending only on the fixed choice of f_i, and on the Lipschitz constant of $t \mapsto q_t$. It moreover takes image in $M_{m(2N+1)}(\widetilde{S}^{M_i})$, where M_i is the degree of f_n. It follows from all of this that we may take $h_\epsilon(t) := f_i(q_t)$ for some suitably large i, and this will have all the right properties.

We now turn to the case of K_1. Let $[u]$ satisfy the hypotheses, so there exist $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and a homotopy $\{u_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $U^{1/8}_{l+j}(C([0,1],\widetilde{S}))$ such that

$$u_0 = \mathrm{diag}(u, 1_j) \quad \text{and} \quad u_1 = \mathrm{diag}(1_l, 1_j).$$

Set $m = l + j$. Let $0 = t_0 < \cdots < t_N = 1$ be such that

$$\|u_{t_i} - u_{t_{i-1}}\| < 1/32 \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, ..., N\}. \tag{7.2}$$

We will define a Lipschitz homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(u_0, 1_{2mN}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(u_1, 1_{2mN}).$$

by concatenating the homotopies below.

(i) Connect

$$\mathrm{diag}(u_0, 1_{2mN}) = \mathrm{diag}(u_0, \underbrace{1_m, ..., 1_m}_{N}, 1_{mN})$$
$$\text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(u_0, u_{t_1}^* u_{t_1}, ..., u_{t_N}^* u_{t_N}, 1_{mN})$$

by the straight line homotopy between the i^{th} copy of 1_m and $u_{t_i}^* u_{t_i}$.

(ii) Use a rotation homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(1_m, u_{t_1}^*, ..., u_{t_N}^*, 1_{mN}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(u_{t_1}^*, ..., u_{t_N}^*, 1_m, 1_{mN}),$$

to produce a homotopy between

$$\mathrm{diag}(u_0, u_{t_1}^* u_{t_1}, ..., u_{t_N}^* u_{t_N}, 1_{mN})$$
$$= \mathrm{diag}(1_m, u_{t_1}^*, ..., u_{t_N}^*, 1_{mN})\mathrm{diag}(u_0, u_{t_1}, ..., u_{t_N}, 1_{mN})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diag}(u_{t_1}^* u_0, u_{t_2}^* u_{t_1}, ..., u_{t_N}^* u_{t_N-1}, u_{t_N} 1_{mN}) \\ = \mathrm{diag}(u_{t_1}^*, ..., u_{t_N}^*, 1_m, 1_{mN}) \mathrm{diag}(u_0, u_{t_1}, ..., u_{t_N}, 1_{mN}).\end{aligned}$$

(iii) Use another straight line homotopy between each $u_{t_i}^* u_{t_{i-1}}$ and 1_m to build a homotopy between

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{diag}(u_{t_1}^* u_0, u_{t_2}^* u_{t_1}, ...,u_{t_N}^* u_{t_N-1}, u_{t_N}, 1_{mN}) \\ \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{1_m, ..., 1_m}_{N}, u_{t_N}, 1_{mN})\end{aligned}$$

(iv) Finally, one more rotation homotopy connects

$$\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{1_m, ..., 1_m}_{N}, u_{t_N}, 1_{mN}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{diag}(u_1, 1_{2mN}),$$

where we used that $u_{t_N} = u_1$.

Write $\{v_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ for the homotopy resulting from concatenating the above homotopies; it is straightforward to check that this homotopy is Lipschitz for some universal Lipschitz constant, and that each v_t is a matrix in $M_{m(2N+1)}(\widetilde{S}^2)$.

We claim that for each t,

$$\|v_t^* v_t - 1\| < 7/8 \quad \text{and} \quad \|v_t v_t^* - 1\| < 7/8. \tag{7.3}$$

For t associated to step (iv), this is immediate. For t associated to both step (ii), this follows from the fact that if v and w are quasi-unitaries, then their product satisfies

$$\|(vw)(vw)^* - 1\| \leqslant \|v(ww^* - 1)v^*\| + \|vv^* - 1\| < (1+1/8)(1/8) + (1/8) < 7/8$$

and similarly $\|(vw)^*(vw) - 1\| < 7/8$. For t associated to steps (i) and (iii), we first claim that if $\delta, \epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\|u - v\| < \epsilon$, and $\|uu^* - 1\| < \delta$ and $\|u^* u - 1\| < \delta$, then

$$\|vv^* - 1\| < \delta + 4\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|v^* v - 1\| < \delta + 4\epsilon. \tag{7.4}$$

Indeed, using that $\|u\| < \sqrt{1+\delta}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|vv^* - 1\| &< \|vv^* - uu^*\| + \delta \leqslant \|v\|\|v^* - u^*\| + \|v - u\|\|u^*\| + \delta \\ &< (\sqrt{1+\delta} + \epsilon)\epsilon + \sqrt{1+\delta}\epsilon + \delta < \delta + 4\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

and the other estimate is similar. Now, looking at step (i), the functional calculus implies that all elements appearing in the homotopy are

within $1/8$ of $\mathrm{diag}(u_0, 1_{2mN})$, so applying the estimate in line (7.4) with $\delta = \epsilon = 1/8$ establishes the estimate in line (7.3). On the other hand, looking at step (iii), we first note that for any $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{t_i}^* u_{t_{i-1}} - 1\| &\leqslant \|u_{t_i}^*\|\|u_{t_i} - u_{t_{i-1}}\| + \|u_{t_i}^* u_{t_i} - 1\| \leqslant \sqrt{1 + 1/8}(1/32) + 1/8 \\ &< 3/16.\end{aligned}$$

Hence every element in the homotopy in step (iii) is within $3/16$ of

$$\mathrm{diag}(1_{mN}, u_{t_N}, 1_{mN}).$$

Applying the estimate in line (7.4) with $\delta = 1/8$ and $\epsilon = 3/16$ then again gives the estimate in line (7.3), and we are done with the claim.

It follows in particular that $(v_t^* v_t)^{-1/2}$ makes sense for all t, and thus we may define $h(t) := \kappa(v_t)$. Moreover, there is a sequence (f_i) of real-valued polynomials that converges uniformly to the function $t \mapsto t^{-1/2}$ on the spectrum of each $v_t^* v_t$. Analogously to the case of K_1, we may now take $h_\epsilon(t) := v_t f_n(v_t^* v_t)$ for some suitably large n (depending on ϵ); this has all the right properties. □

Our main K-theoretic goal is a sort of controlled Mayer-Vietoris sequence. We first need some notation and an appropriate excisiveness condition.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}))$, and A be a C^*-algebra. Let $A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ denote the spatial tensor product of A and $\mathcal{K}$; using the canonical orthonormal basis on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, we identify elements of $A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ with $\mathbb{N}$-by-$\mathbb{N}$ matrices with entries from A. For a subspace S of A, let $S \otimes \mathcal{K}$ denote the subspace of $A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ consisting of matrices with all elements in S.

In particular, it is straightforward to check that a filtration on A induces a filtration on $A \otimes \mathcal{K}$ by defining $(A \otimes \mathcal{K})_r := A_r \otimes \mathcal{K}$.

Definition 7.3. Let $(A^\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ be a collection of filtered C^*-algebras, and filter each stabilization $A^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K}$ as in Definition 7.2. For each $\omega \in \Omega$, let I^ω and J^ω be C^*-ideals in A^ω, which we assume are filtered by the subspaces $I_r^\omega := A_r^\omega \cap I^\omega$ and $J_r^\omega := A_r^\omega \cap J^\omega$. Equip the stabilizations $I^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and $J^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K}$ with the filtrations of Definition 7.2.

The collection $(I^\omega, J^\omega)_{\omega\in\Omega}$ of pairs of ideals is *uniformly excisive* if for any $r_0, m_0 \geqslant 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there are $r \geqslant r_0$, $m \geqslant 0$, and $\delta > 0$ such that:

(i) for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any $a \in (A^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K})_{r_0}$ of norm at most m_0, there exist elements $b \in (I^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K})_r$ and $c \in (J^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K})_r$ of norm at most m such that $\|a - (b + c)\| < \epsilon$;
(ii) for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any $a \in I^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K} \cap J^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K}$ such that

$$d(a, (I^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K})_{r_0}) < \delta \quad \text{and} \quad d(a, (J^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K})_{r_0}) < \delta$$

there exists $b \in I^\omega_r \otimes \mathcal{K} \cap J^\omega_r \otimes \mathcal{K}$ such that $\|a - b\| < \epsilon$.

We are now ready for our controlled Mayer-Vietoris theorem. See [13] for related 'controlled Mayer-Vietoris sequences', approached in a somewhat different way.

Proposition 7.4. *Say $(A^\omega)_{\omega\in\Omega}$ is a collection of non-unital filtered C^*-algebras and $(I^\omega, J^\omega)_{\omega\in\Omega}$ a uniformly excisive collection of pairs of non-unital ideals. Then for any $r_0 \geqslant 0$ there are $r_1, r_2 \geqslant r_0$ with the following property. For each ω and each $x \in K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^\omega)$ there is an element*

$$\partial_c(x) \in K_*^{r_1,1/8}(I^\omega \cap J^\omega)$$

such that if $\partial_c(x) = 0$ then there exist

$$y \in K_*^{r_2,1/8}(I^\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad z \in K_*^{r_2,1/8}(J^\omega)$$

such that

$$x = y + z \quad \text{in} \quad K_*^{r_2,1/8}(A^\omega)$$

(where as usual we abuse notation by omitting explicit notation for subspace-inclusion maps).

The subscript in '∂_c' stands for 'controlled': ∂_c is a controlled analogue of the usual Mayer-Vietoris boundary map in K-theory. It will be crucial for our applications that the numbers r_0, r_1, r_2 appearing in the above are all independent of the index ω.

Proof. Let Λ be a set equipped with a map $\pi : \Lambda \to \Omega$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ denote the compact operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and let $\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda} A^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ denote the C^*-algebra of bounded, Λ-indexed sequences where the λ^{th} element comes

from $A^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. With notation as in Definition 7.2, define

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda := \left\{ (a_\lambda) \in \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda} A^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K} \;\middle|\; \text{there is } r \geqslant 0 \text{ with } a_\lambda \in A_r^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K} \text{ for all } \lambda \right\},$$

which is a $*$-subalgebra of $\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda} A^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K}$, and let A_Λ be its C^*-algebraic closure. Define also $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda$ to be

$$\left\{ (a_\lambda) \in \mathcal{A}_\Lambda \;\middle|\; \text{there is } r \geqslant 0 \text{ with } a_\lambda \in I_r^{\pi(\lambda)} \otimes \mathcal{K} \text{ for all } \lambda \right\}$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{J}_\Lambda$. As I^ω and J^ω are ideals in A^ω for each ω, $\mathcal{I}_\Lambda$ and $\mathcal{J}_\Lambda$ are $*$-ideals in $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$, whence their closures I_Λ and J_Λ are C^*-ideals in A_Λ. Moreover, the uniform excisiveness assumption implies that $A_\Lambda = I_\Lambda + J_\Lambda$. Hence (see for example [7, Section 3]) there is a six-term exact Mayer-Vietoris sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K_0(A_\Lambda) & \longrightarrow & K_0(I_\Lambda) \oplus K_0(J_\Lambda) & \longrightarrow & K_0(I_\Lambda \cap J_\Lambda) \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle \partial} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \partial} \\ K_1(I_\Lambda \cap J_\Lambda) & \longleftarrow & K_1(I_\Lambda) \oplus K_1(J_\Lambda) & \longleftarrow & K_1(A_\Lambda). \end{array} \tag{7.5}$$

From now on, we will focus on the case of K_0; the case of K_1 is essentially the same. Define

$$\Lambda := \{(\omega, x) \mid \omega \in \Omega,\ x \in K_0^{r_0,1/8}(A^\omega)\}$$

equipped with the map $\pi : \Lambda \to \Omega$ that sends an element to its first coordinate. For each $\lambda = (\omega, x) \in \Lambda$ choose a pair

$$(p_\lambda, n_\lambda) \in P_{m_\lambda}^{1/8}(A_{r_0}^\omega) \times \mathbb{N}$$

for some $m_\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Definition 4.1 for notation) such that $x = [p_\lambda, n_\lambda]$. Identifying $M_{m_\lambda}(A^\omega)$ with the C^*-subalgebra of $A^\omega \otimes \mathcal{K}$ consisting of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ matrices that are only non-zero in the first $m \times m$ square in the top left corner, we get a well-defined element $\vec{p} := (p_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ of A_J. With κ as in Definition 4.1, the formal difference

$$\vec{x} := [(\kappa(p_\lambda))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}] - [(1_{n_\lambda})_{\lambda\in\Lambda}]$$

defines an element of $K_0(A_\Lambda)$, and so the Mayer-Vietoris sequence of line (7.5) gives an element $\partial(\vec{x})$ in $K_1(I_\Lambda \cap J_\Lambda)$. We may represent $\partial(\vec{x})$ as a Λ-indexed collection $(u_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$, where each u_λ is a unitary in a matrix algebra over the unitization of $I^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap J^{\pi(\lambda)}$. On the other hand, by definition of I_Λ and J_Λ and by the uniform excisiveness condition there is $r_1 \geqslant 0$ (which we may assume is at least r_0) and a sequence

$(v_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ with each v_λ in some matrix algebra over the space spanned by $I^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap J^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap A_{r_1}^{\pi(\lambda)}$ and the unit, and so that $\|u_\lambda - v_\lambda\| < 1/20$. From this estimate, one checks that each v_λ is a quasi-unitary as in Definition 4.4 and thus defines a class $[v_\lambda] \in K_1^{r_1,1/8}(I^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap J^{\pi(\lambda)})$. For each $\lambda = (\omega, x) \in J$, define

$$\partial_c(x) := [v_\lambda] \in K_1^{r_1,1/8}(I^\omega \cap J^\omega).$$

We now look at what happens when $\partial_c(x) = 0$. Let $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$ be the subset of all $(\omega, x) \in \Lambda$ such that $\partial_c(x) = 0$ in $K_1^{r_1,1/8}(I^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap J^{\pi(\lambda)})$. Define a new element $\vec{x}\,' \in K_0(A_\Lambda)$ by setting the λ^{th} component equal to $[\kappa(p_\lambda)] - [1_{n_\lambda}]$ if $\lambda \in \Lambda'$, and equal to 0 otherwise.

For each $\lambda = (\omega, x) \in \Lambda'$ let v_λ be a quasi-unitary such that $\partial_c(x) = [v_\lambda]$. The fact that $[v_\lambda]$ is zero in $K_1^{r_1,1/8}(I^{\pi(\lambda)} \cap T^{\pi(\lambda)})$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda'$ and Lemma 7.1 together give a homotopy between a stabilized version of the sequence $(\kappa(v_\lambda))_{\lambda\in\Lambda'}$ and zero in $I_\Lambda \cap J_\Lambda$. With ∂ the standard boundary map as in diagram (7.5) we thus have that $\partial(\vec{x}\,') = 0$ in $K_1(I_\Lambda \cap J_\Lambda)$. Hence by exactness of the Mayer-Vietoris sequence there are elements $\vec{y} \in K_0(I_\Lambda)$ and $\vec{z} \in K_0(J_\Lambda)$ such that $\vec{x}\,' = \vec{y} + \vec{z}$ in $K_0(A_\Lambda)$ (as usual, we have suppressed notation for subspace-inclusion maps). Suitably approximating representatives of $\vec{y}$ and $\vec{z}$ in each component and applying the injectivity part of Lemma 4.9 gives the desired conclusion. □

Dynamical part. We now use the dynamical assumptions to produce ingredients for the K-theoretic machine just built, and thus complete the proof of Proposition 5.2.

First, we define the algebras we will be using. These are subalgebras of our usual obstruction C^*-algebras A^s from Definition 3.9. However, it is an important technical point that the filtrations we put on these subalgebras will *not* be the induced filtrations from A^s: here is the filtration that will be useful for the proof.

Definition 7.5. Fix $s_0 \geqslant 0$. Let Ω be the set of all triples $\omega = (G_0, G_1, s)$, where G_0 and G_1 are open subgroupoids of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ and $s \geqslant s_0$.

For $\omega = (G_0, G_1, s)$ and $r \geqslant 0$, define a subspace A_r^ω of A^s by

$$A_r^\omega := A^{s_0}(G_0^{+r})_r + A^{s_0}(G_1^{+r})_r + A^s(G_0^{+r} \cap G_1^{+r})$$

and define also

$$A^\omega := \overline{\bigcup_{r \geqslant 0} A_r^\omega}$$

(where the closure is in the norm topology of A^s). Define subspaces of A_r^ω by

$$I_r^\omega := A^{s_0}(G_0^{+r})_r + A^s(G_0^{+r} \cap G_1^{+r}), \quad J_r^\omega := A^{s_0}(G_1^{+r})_r + A^s(G_0^{+r} \cap G_1^{+r})$$

and finally define

$$I^\omega := \overline{\bigcup_{r \geqslant 0} I_r^\omega}, \quad J^\omega := \overline{\bigcup_{r \geqslant 0} J_r^\omega}.$$

We want to show that each A^ω is a filtered C^*-algebra, that I^ω and J^ω are ideals in A^ω, and that the collection $(I^\omega, J^\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ is uniformly excisive in the sense of Definition 7.3. This requires some preliminaries on 'partition of unity' type constructions. The next definition and lemma use several constructions from Sections 2 and 3; the reader should look back at these for definitions.

Definition 7.6. Let K be a compact subset of X, let $\{U_0, ..., U_n\}$ be a finite open cover of K, and let $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ be a subordinate partition of unity: precisely, each ϕ_i is a continuous function $X \to [0, 1]$ with support contained in U_i, and for each $x \in K$, $\phi_0(x) + \cdots + \phi_n(x) = 1$.

Let $s \geqslant 0$ and recall the definitions of the Rips complex $P_s(\Gamma)$, barycentric coordinates $t_g : P_s(\Gamma) \to [0, 1]$, and Hilbert space $H_s := \ell^2(Z_s \times X, H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma))$ from Section 2. For $i \in \{0, ..., n\}$, let M_i be the multiplication operator on H_s associated to the function

$$Z_s \times X \to [0, 1], \quad (z, x) \mapsto \sum_{g \in \Gamma} t_g(z)\phi_i(gx).$$

For the next lemma, recall the notion of support of an operator in $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ from Definition 3.2 above.

Lemma 7.7. *With notation as in Definition 7.6, the operators M_i have the following properties.*

(i) Each M_i has norm at most one.

(ii) If $T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ *satisfies*

$$\{x \in X \mid (gx, g, x) \in \mathit{supp}(T) \text{ for some } g \in \Gamma\} \subseteq K,$$

then $T = T(M_0 + \cdots + M_n)$.

(iii) For any $T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ *with* Γ*-propagation at most* r*, and* $i \in \{0, ..., n\}$,

$$\mathit{supp}(TM_i) \subseteq \left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant s} h \cdot U_i,\ |g| \leqslant r \right\} \cap \mathit{supp}(T).$$

Proof. Part (i) follows as each M_i is a multiplication operator associated to a function with range contained in $[0, 1]$. For use in the remainder of the proof, note that for $i \in \{0, ..., n\}$, any $T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ and any $y, z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ and $x \in X$,

$$(TM_i)_{y,z}(x) = T_{y,z}(x) \cdot \sum_{h \in \Gamma} t_h(z)\phi_i(hx). \tag{7.6}$$

Hence

$$T(M_0 + \cdots + M_n)_{y,z}(x) = T_{y,z}(x) \cdot \sum_{h \in \Gamma} t_h(z)(\phi_0(hx) + \cdots + \phi_n(hx)). \tag{7.7}$$

Assume now T satisfies the support condition in part (ii). If $T_{y,z}(x) = 0$, then clearly the above is zero. Otherwise, if $T_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$, then $(gx, gh^{-1}, hx) \in \mathrm{supp}(T)$ for all $g \in \mathrm{supp}(y)$ and $h \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$. In particular, $hx \in K$ for all $h \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$, and so

$$\sum_{h \in \Gamma} t_h(z)(\phi_0(hx) + \cdots + \phi_n(hx)) = \sum_{h \in \Gamma} t_h(z) = 1,$$

using that $\{\phi_0, ..., \phi_n\}$ is a partition of unity on K; combined with line (7.7), this gives part (ii).

For part (iii), say $(gx, gk^{-1}, kx) \in \mathrm{supp}(TM_i)$ for some $T \in C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ with Γ-propagation at most r. Hence there are $y, z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ with $g \in \mathrm{supp}(y)$, $k \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$ and $(TM_i)_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$. From line (7.6), this implies that $T_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$, whence $(gx, gk^{-1}, kx) \in \mathrm{supp}(T)$, and so moreover $|gk^{-1}| \leqslant r$ by the assumption that T has Γ-propagation at most r. On the other hand, we must also have

$$\sum_{h \in \Gamma} t_h(z)\phi_i(hx) \neq 0,$$

whence there is $h \in \mathrm{supp}(z)$ with $\phi_i(hx) \neq 0$, and thus hx is in U_i. As h and k are both in $\mathrm{supp}(z)$ and z is in $P_s(\Gamma)$, this forces $|kh^{-1}| \leqslant s$.

On the other hand, $kx = (kh^{-1})hx$ is in $(kh^{-1})U_i$, which completes the proof. □

Lemma 7.8. *For each $s_0 \geqslant 0$ and $\omega = (G_0, G_1, s) \in \Omega$, A^ω as in Definition 7.5 is a filtered C^*-algebra with respect to the subspaces $(A^\omega_r)_{r\geqslant 0}$. Moreover I^ω and J^ω are C^*-ideals in A^ω, and the collection $(I^\omega, J^\omega)_{i\in I}$ is uniformly excisive.*

Proof. Each A^ω_r is self-adjoint as it is a sum of subspaces that are themselves self-adjoint by Lemma 3.3. It is clear that $A^\omega_{r_0} \subseteq A^\omega_r$ for $r_0 \leqslant r$, and the union $\bigcup_{r\geqslant 0} A^\omega_r$ is dense in A^ω by definition. To complete the proof that A^ω is filtered and I^ω, J^ω are ideals we must look at products. Let $r_1, r_2 \geqslant 0$. First, note that the inclusions

$$A^{s_0}(G_i^{+r_1})_{r_1} \cdot A^{s_0}(G_i^{+r_2})_{r_2} \subseteq A^{s_0}(G_i^{+(r_1+r_2)})_{r_1+r_2}, \quad i \in \{0,1\},$$

and

$$A^s(G_0^{+r_1} \cap G_1^{+r_1}) \cdot A^s(G_0^{+r_2} \cap G_1^{+r_2}) \subseteq A^s(G_0^{+(r_1+r_2)} \cap G_1^{+(r_1+r_2)})$$

follow directly from Lemmas 3.3 and 3.12. Similarly,

$$A^{s_0}(G_0^{+r_1})_{r_1} \cdot A^{s_0}(G_1^{+r_2})_{r_2} \subseteq A^{s_0}(G_0^{+(r_1+r_2)})_{r_1+r_2} \cap A^{s_0}(G_1^{+(r_1+r_2)})_{r_1+r_2}$$

and finally, using that $A^{s_0}(G)_r \subseteq A^s(G)_r$ for any open G and $r \geqslant 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} A^{s_0}(G_i^{+r_1})_{r_1} \cdot A^s(G_0^{+r_2} \cap G_0^{+r_2}) &\subseteq A^s((G_0^{+r_2} \cap G_0^{+r_2})^{+r_1}) \\ &\subseteq A^s((G_0^{+r_2})^{+r_1} \cap (G_0^{+r_2})^{+r_1}) \\ &\subseteq A^s(G_0^{+(r_1+r_2)} \cap G_0^{+(r_1+r_2)}) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in \{0,1\}$, where the last step uses Lemma 3.13. Combining the last four displayed lines completes the check that A^ω is filtered. Moreover, they show that I^ω and J^ω are C^*-ideals in A^ω.

We now have to check that the collection $(I^\omega, J^\omega)_{\omega\in\Omega}$ is uniformly excisive as in Definition 7.3. For notational simplicity, we will ignore the copy of the compact operators appearing in Definition 7.3: the reader can readily check this makes no difference to the proof.

Look first at part (i) of the definition. Let U_i be the unit space of $G_i^{+r_0}$ for $i \in \{0,1\}$. Say a is an element of $A^\omega_{r_0}$, whence

$$K := \overline{\{x \in X \mid (gx, g, x) \in \operatorname{supp}(a(t)) \text{ for some } t \in [0,\infty), g \in \Gamma\}},$$

is a compact subset of $U_0 \cup U_1$. Let M_0, M_1 be as in Definition 7.6 with respect to the Rips complex $P_s(\Gamma)$, the compact set K, the open sets U_0 and U_1, and some choice of partition of unity $\{\phi_0, \phi_1\}$. From Lemma 7.7 part (i) we have that $\|M_0\| \leqslant 1$ and $\|M_1\| \leqslant 1$, and from part (ii) that $a(t)(M_0 + M_1) = a(t)$ for all t. Hence to complete the proof that our algebras satisfy part (i) of Definition 7.3, it suffices to show that there exists $r \geqslant 0$ (which is allowed to depend on r_0 and s_0, but not on s) such that for each ω, $t \mapsto a(t)M_0$ is in I_r^ω and $t \mapsto a(t)M_1$ is in J_r^ω. We focus on the case of M_0 and I^ω; the other case is similar. We claim that in fact $r = 2r_0 + s_0$ works.

Write $a = b_0 + b_1 + c$, where $b_i \in A^{s_0}(G_i^{+r_0})_{r_0}$ and $c \in A^s(G_0^{+r_0} \cap G_1^{+r_0})$. Part (iii) of Lemma 7.7 implies that for each $t \in [0, \infty)$

$$\operatorname{supp}(b_0(t)M_0) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(b_0(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{supp}(c(t)M_0) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(c(t)),$$

from which it follows straightforwardly that $t \mapsto b_0(t)M_0$ and $t \mapsto c(t)M_0$ are in $A^{s_0}(G_0^{+r_0})_{r_0}$ and $A^s(G_0^{+r_0} \cap G_1^{+r_0})$ respectively; moreover, these are subspaces of I_r^ω. To complete the proof, we check that $t \mapsto b_1(t)M_0$ is in I_r^ω.

Assume that (gx, gh^{-1}, hx) is in the support of $b_1(t)M_0$ for some t, and write $T = b_1(t)$ for ease of notation. Then there exist $y, z \in P_s(\Gamma)$ with $g \in \operatorname{supp}(y)$, $h \in \operatorname{supp}(z)$ and $(TM_0)_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$. Hence from line (7.6) we must have that $T_{y,z}(x) \neq 0$ and so y, z are actually in $P_{s_0}(\Gamma)$ and $|gh^{-1}| \leqslant r_0 \leqslant r$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{k \in \Gamma} t_k(z)\phi_0(kx) \neq 0,$$

whence there is $k \in \operatorname{supp}(z)$ such that $\phi_0(kx) \neq 0$, and in particular, kx is in the unit space of $G_0^{+r_0}$. On the other hand,

$$(gx, gh^{-1}, hx) = (gx, gk^{-1}, kx)(kx, kh^{-1}, hx).$$

The first factor in the product is in $(G_0^{+r_0})^{+r_0} \subseteq G_0^{+2r_0}$ using that $|gk^{-1}| \leqslant r_0$, that kx is in the unit space of $G_0^{+r_0}$, and Lemma 3.13. The second factor is in $(G_0^{+r_0})^{+s_0} \subseteq G_0^{+(r_0+s_0)}$ using that $|kh^{-1}| \leqslant s_0$, that kx is in the unit space of $G_0^{+r_0}$, and Lemma 3.13. Hence (gx, gh^{-1}, hx) is in $G_0^{+(2r_0+s_0)}$. To summarize, we have shown at this point that $b_1(t)M_0$ has support in $G_0^{+(2r_0+s_0)}$ for all t, and thus $t \mapsto b_1(t)M_0$ is in $A^{s_0}(G_0^{+r})_r$ as claimed.

We now look at part (ii) of Definition 7.3. Say a is in both I^ω and J^ω, and that a is within $\delta := \epsilon/3$ of both $I^\omega_{r_0}$ and $J^\omega_{r_0}$. Let a_0 and a_1 be elements of $I^\omega_{r_0}$ and $J^\omega_{r_0}$ respectively which are at most δ away from a. Define

$$K := \overline{\{x \in X \mid (gx, g, x) \in \mathrm{supp}(a_0(t)) \text{ for some } t \in [0,\infty), g \in \Gamma\}},$$

a compact subset of the unit space U_0 of $G_0^{+r_0}$. Let M_0 be as in Definition 7.6 with respect to the Rips complex $P_s(\Gamma)$, the compact set K, and the open cover $\{U_0\}$ of K. From Lemma 7.7 parts (i) and (ii) we have that $\|M_0\| \leqslant 1$ and that $a_0(t)M_0 = a_0(t)$ for all t. Hence for any $t \in [0,\infty)$

$$\|a(t) - a_1(t)M_0\| \leqslant \|a(t) - a_0(t)\| + \|a_0(t) - a(t)M_0\| + \|a(t)M_0 - a_1(t)M_0\| < \epsilon.$$

On the other hand, an argument precisely analogous to the one used above to establish part (i) of Definition 7.3 shows that $a_1(t)M_0$ is contained in $I^\omega_r \cap J^\omega_r$, where $r = 2r_0 + s_0$, and we are done. □

Here then is the proof of Proposition 5.2, the last step we need in the proof of Theorem 2.10.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof proceeds by induction on d. Consider first the base case $d = 0$. Let r_0 and s_0 be given. We claim $r = \max\{r_0, s_0\}$ has the right properties in case $d = 0$. Indeed, the assumption on G implies in particular that the subgroupoid G' of G generated by

$$\{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \rtimes X \mid x, gx \in G^{(0)}, |g| \leqslant r_0, g \in G\}$$

has compact closure. Then

$$G \cap \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant r_0\} = G' \cap \{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant r_0\}$$

whence $A^{s_0}(G)_{r_0} = A^{s_0}(G')_{r_0}$, and therefore the natural map

$$K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G')) \to K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G))$$

is the identity. On the other hand, if s is as in the assumptions then $A^s(G')_s = A^s(G')$ and so

$$K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G')) = K_*(A^s(G'))$$

by Lemma 4.9. Moreover, the group on the right hand side is zero by Proposition 5.1. Putting this together, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G)) & \longrightarrow & K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G)) \\ = \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G')) & \longrightarrow & K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G')) = 0 \end{array}$$

of subspace inclusion maps. This completes the proof of the base case.

Assume now that the result holds for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $r_0, s_0 \geqslant 0$ be given. Let $r_1, r_2 \geqslant r_0$ be the constants given by Proposition 7.4 with respect to the uniformly excisive family from Lemma 7.8, which depend only on r_0 and s_0. Let $r_3 \geqslant \max\{r_2, s_0\}$ be as in the inductive hypothesis for the 'input data' r_2, s_0 and d (so r_2 plays the role of r_0 in the statement). Finally, set $r = r_3 + r_2 + r_0 + s_0$, which only depends on $d+1$, r_0 and s_0; we claim this has the right properties.

Let G, $\{U_0, ..., U_{d+1}\}$ be as in the assumptions for the $(d+1)^{\text{th}}$ case. Set now

$$W_0 := \bigcup_{i=0}^{d} U_i \quad \text{and} \quad W_1 = U_{d+1},$$

so in particular $G^{(0)} = W_0 \cup W_1$. For each $i \in \{0, 1\}$, let G_i be the (open) subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant r_0,\ x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant s_0} h \cdot W_i \right\}. \tag{7.8}$$

We claim that our assumptions imply that

$$A^{s_0}(G)_{r_0} \subseteq A^{s_0}(G_0)_{r_0} + A^{s_0}(G_1)_{r_0}. \tag{7.9}$$

Indeed, say a is an element of the left hand side, whence

$$K = \overline{\{x \in X \mid (gx, g, x) \in \operatorname{supp}(a(t)) \text{ for some } t \in [0, \infty)\}}$$

is a compact subset of $G^{(0)}$. Let M_0 and M_1 be operators as in Definition 7.6, chosen with respect to some partition of unity subordinate to the open cover $\{W_0, W_1\}$ of K. Then part (ii) of Lemma 7.7 implies that $a(t) = a(t)(M_0 + M_1)$ for all t. On the other hand, part (iii) of

Lemma 7.7 implies that the support of each $a(t)M_i$ is contained in

$$\left\{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant r_0,\ x \in \bigcup_{|h|\leqslant s_0} h \cdot W_i\right\},$$

which in turn is exactly the generating set of G_i as in line (7.8) above; this establishes the claimed inclusion in line (7.9).

Let now s be as in the statement, and let $\omega = (G_0, G_1, s)$ and $A := A^\omega$, $I := I^\omega$, $J := J^\omega$ be as in Definition 7.5. Let x be an element of the left hand side $K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G))$. The inclusion in line (7.9) above implies in particular that $A^{s_0}(G)_{r_0}$ is contained in A_{r_0}, so we get a subspace-inclusion map

$$K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G)) \to K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A).$$

Abusing notation, denote by $x \in K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A)$ the image of x under this subspace-inclusion map. Proposition 7.4 gives a 'boundary map'

$$\partial_c : K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A) \to K_*^{r_1,1/8}(I \cap J).$$

Note however that $I \cap J \cap A_{r_1}$ identifies with $A^s(G_0^{+r_1} \cap G_1^{+r_1})$, which is a C^*-algebra. Hence by Lemma 4.9,

$$K_*^{r_1,1/8}(I \cap J) \cong K_*(A^s(G_0^{+r_1} \cap G_1^{+r_1})). \tag{7.10}$$

As $r \geqslant \max\{r_0, r_1, s_0\}$, $G_1^{+r_1}$ (whence also $G_0^{+r_1} \cap G_1^{+r_1}$) is contained in the groupoid $G_{1'}^{+r}$, where $G_{1'}$ is the groupoid generated by

$$\left\{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \rtimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h|\leqslant r} h \cdot W_1,\ |g| \leqslant r\right\}. \tag{7.11}$$

On the other hand, $G_{1'}^{+r}$ is contained in

$$\{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}$$

by the assumptions on s and the set $W_1 = U_{d+1}$. Hence Proposition 5.1 gives that the (uncontrolled) group on the right of line (7.10) is zero. In particular, $\partial_c(x) = 0$.

Now, Proposition 7.4 gives the existence of

$$y \in K_*^{r_2,1/8}(I), \quad z \in K_*^{r_2,1/8}(J)$$

such that $x = y + z$ in $K_*^{r_2,1/8}(A)$. The subspaces I_{r_2} and J_{r_2} are contained in $A^s(G_0^{+r_2})_s$ and $A^s(G_1^{+r_2})_s$ respectively, so we get subspace

inclusion maps

(7.12)
$$K_*^{r_2,1/8}(I) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_0^{+r_2})), \quad K_*^{r_2,1/8}(J) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_1^{+r_2})).$$

Looking at the second of these two maps using that $r \geqslant r_2$, we have that $G_1^{+r_2} \subseteq G_{1'}^{+r}$, where $G_{1'}$ is generated by the set in line (7.11) above. The choice of s and Lemma 4.9 thus imply that the semigroup $K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_1^{+r_2}))$ is isomorphic to the uncontrolled group $K_*(A^s(G_1^{+r_2}))$; and the latter is zero by Proposition 5.1 and our assumption on s again. On the other hand, look at the first of the two maps in line (7.12). For each $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, set

$$V_i := \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r_2 + s_0} h \cdot U_i$$

so each V_i is an open subset of X. As G_0 is generated by the set in line (7.8), we have in particular that the unit space of $G_0^{+r_2}$ is equal to $\bigcup_{i=0}^d V_i$, and thus the open sets $V_0, ..., V_d$ satisfy property (i) from the inductive hypotheses for $G_0^{+r_2}$. Checking property (ii), for $i \in \{0, ..., d\}$, let H_i be the subgroupoid of $\Gamma \ltimes X$ generated by

$$\left\{ (gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \;\middle|\; x \in \bigcup_{|h| \leqslant r_3} h \cdot V_i, \ |g| \leqslant r_3 \right\}.$$

As $r \geqslant r_3 + r_2 + s_0$, our assumptions on the original sets $U_0, ..., U_{d+1}$ imply that each expansion $H_i^{+r_3}$ has compact closure contained in

$$\{(gx, g, x) \in \Gamma \ltimes X \mid |g| \leqslant s\}.$$

Thus the inductive hypothesis applies to G_0, and we see that the composition

$$K_*^{r_2,1/8}(I) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_0^{+r_2})) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_0^{+(r_2+r_3)}))$$

is zero, where the first map is the first subspace inclusion map in line (7.12), and the second is the subspace-inclusion map induced by including $G_0^{+r_2}$ in $(G_0^{+r_2})^{+r_3}$ and the inclusion $(G_0^{+r_2})^{+r_3} \subseteq G_0^{+(r_2+r_3)}$ of Lemma 3.13.

Putting what we have so far together, our (arbitrary) element $x \in K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G))$ satisfies $x = y + z$ in $K_*^{r_2,1/8}(A)$, where y and z are zero in

$$K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_0^{+(r_2+r_3)})) \quad \text{and} \quad K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G_1^{+(r_2+r_3)}))$$

respectively. On the other hand, G_0 and G_1 are both contained in $G^{+(r_0+s_0)}$, whence (applying Lemma 3.13) $G_0^{+(r_2+r_3)}$ and $G_1^{+(r_3+r_3)}$ are both contained in $G^{+(r_0+s_0+r_2+r_3)} = G^{+r}$ by definition of r. Finally, then, under the subspace-inclusion map

$$K_*^{r_0,1/8}(A^{s_0}(G)) \to K_*^{s,1/8}(A^s(G^{+r}))$$

we have that both $x = y + z$ and $y = z = 0$ on the right hand side. This completes the induction and the proof. □

Appendix A. Comparison to the Baum-Connes assembly map

The purpose of this appendix is to identify the standard picture of the Baum-Connes assembly map for Γ with coefficients in $C(X)$ as discussed in say [1], with our picture defined using localization algebras and the evaluation-at-zero map. As it is no more complicated and may be useful for other work, we do this in more generality than necessary for this paper in that we allow $C(X)$ to be replaced by an arbitrary (separable) Γ-C^*-algebra A.

Of necessity, we assume more of the reader than in the rest of the paper: specifically, some working knowledge of Hilbert modules (see [10] for background and conventions) and of equivariant KK-theory (see [9, Section 2] for background and conventions). On the other hand, it is certainly not necessary to read this appendix to understand the rest of the paper.

Definition A.1. Let Γ be a countable discrete group, and A a (separable) Γ-C^*-algebra. Let Y be a locally compact metric space, equipped with a proper, co-compact, and isometric Γ-action, and fix a compact subset $K \subseteq Y$ such that $\Gamma \cdot K = Y$. Let H_Y be a non-degenerate, covariant representation of $C_0(Y)$ with the property that no non-zero element of Y acts as a compact operator. Let H be a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space equipped with the trivial Γ action.

Define the Hilbert A-module ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ to be the tensor product

$${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A := H_Y \otimes A \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)$$

(here the tensor products are completed external tensor product of Hilbert modules: see [10, Chapter 4]). We write elementary tensors in

${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ as

$$\xi \otimes a \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta, \quad \xi \in H_Y,\ a \in A,\ \eta \in H,\ \zeta \in \ell^2(\Gamma).$$

The actions of Γ on $C_0(Y)$ and A are denoted γ and α respectively, and the unitaries implementing the action of $g \in \Gamma$ on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$ and H_Y are denoted by λ_g and u_g respectively. We define an action ϵ of Γ on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ by

$$\epsilon_g(\xi \otimes a \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta) := u_g\xi \otimes \alpha_g(a) \otimes \eta \otimes \lambda_g\zeta.$$

We write $\widetilde{\epsilon}$ for the Γ-action on the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$ of adjointable operators on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ defined for $e \in E$ by

$$(\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(T))(e) := \epsilon_g(T(\epsilon_{g^{-1}}(e)));$$

note that even though the linear isometries $\epsilon_g : {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ are not adjointable operators, we nonetheless have that if T is adjointable, then $\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(T)$ is too.

The A-valued inner product on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ is given on elementary tensors by

$$\langle \xi_1 \otimes a_1 \otimes \eta_1 \otimes \zeta_1\ ,\ \xi_2 \otimes a_2 \otimes \eta_2 \otimes \zeta_2 \rangle := \langle \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle \langle \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \rangle a_1^* a_2,$$

the right action of $a_1 \in A$ by

$$(\xi \otimes a \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta) \cdot a_1 := \xi \otimes aa_1 \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta,$$

and the left action of $f \in C_0(Y)$ by

$$f \cdot (\xi \otimes a \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta) = f\xi \otimes a \otimes \eta \otimes \zeta; \tag{A.1}$$

if we need notation for this representation, we will denote it by $\pi : C_0(Y) \to \mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$, but we will generally omit the π when no confusion is likely to arise.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$ the compact operators on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ in the sense of Hilbert module theory, so in this case $\mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$ is naturally isomorphic to $\mathcal{K}(H_Y \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma)) \otimes A$ (see [10, pages 9-10]). We will need the following properties of an adjointable operator T on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$.

(i) T is *locally compact* if for any $f \in C_0(Y)$, fT and Tf are in the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$.
(ii) The *support* of T, denoted $\mathrm{supp}(T)$, is the complement of the set

$$\left\{ (y,z) \in Y \times Y \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \text{there are } f_1, f_2 \in C_0(Y) \text{ with } f_1(y) \neq 0, f_2(y) \neq 0 \\ \text{and } f_1 T f_2 = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

The *metric propagation* of T is the extended real number

$$\sup\{d(y,z) \mid (y,z) \in \mathrm{supp}(T)\}.$$

(iii) The Γ-*propagation* of T is the extended real number

$$\sup\{|g| \mid \mathrm{supp}(T) \cap K \times gK \neq \varnothing\}$$

(where we recall that $K \subseteq Y$ is a fixed compact set satisfying $\Gamma \cdot K = Y$).

(iv) T is Γ-*invariant* if $\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(T) = T$ for all $g \in \Gamma$.

The *Roe algebra*, denoted $C^*(Y;A)$, associated to ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ is the C^*-algebra closure of the $*$-algebra of all finite Γ-propagation, locally compact, Γ-invariant adjointable operators on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ for the norm inherited from $\mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$. The *localization algebra*, denoted $C^*_L(Y;A)$, associated to ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ is the C^*-algebra completion of the $*$-algebra all bounded, uniformly continuous functions

$$a : [0,\infty) \to C^*(Y;A)$$

such that the Γ-propagation of $a(t)$ is bounded independently of t, such that the metric propagation tends to zero as t tends to infinity, and where the norm is given by $\sup_t \|a(t)\|_{C^*(Y;A)}$.

Remark A.2. (i) The exact numerical value of the Γ-propagation as defined above depends on the choice of compact set $K \subseteq Y$ with $\Gamma \cdot K = Y$. However, whether or not the Γ-propagation of a family of operators is bounded does not depend on the choice of K, whence the Roe algebras and localization algebras do not depend on this choice.

(ii) Say $Y = P_s(\Gamma)$ is a Rips complex of Γ and set $H_Y = \ell^2(Z_s)$ as in Definition 2.1. Say $A = C(X)$. Considering $\ell^2(X)$ as a left A-module, we may form the internal Hilbert module tensor product of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ and $\ell^2(X)$ over A (see [10, Chapter 4]), and thus get an isomorphism of Hilbert spaces

$${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \otimes_A \ell^2(X) \cong H_Y \otimes \ell^2(X) \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(\Gamma).$$

The map

$$\mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A) \to \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes H_Y \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(X)), \quad T \mapsto T \otimes_A 1_{\ell^2(X)}$$

from the adjointable operators on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ to the bounded operators on $\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes H_Y \otimes H \otimes \ell^2(X)$ is then an isometric $*$-homomorphism

(see the discussion on [10, page 42]), and it is not difficult to check that it takes the Roe algebra $C^*(Y;A)$ onto the Roe algebra $C^*(\Gamma \curvearrowright X; s)$ as in Definition 2.3. Thus the two notions agree in this special case.

(iii) Note that if $Y = P_s(\Gamma)$, then we may use $H_Y = \ell^2(Z_s)$ (to avoid silly degeneracies, we should assume here that s is large enough that $P_s(\Gamma)$ is not zero-dimensional). It is clear then that if $s \leqslant t$, there are isometric inclusions $C^*(P_s(\Gamma); A) \to C^*(P_t(\Gamma); A)$, and similarly for the localization algebras.

Now, there is an evaluation-at-zero map

$$\epsilon_0 : K_*(C^*_L(Y;A)) \to K_*(C^*(Y;A))$$

induced by the obvious underlying $*$-homomorphism. Our goal here is to relate this to the Baum-Connes assembly map for Γ with coefficients in A as in [1, Section 9].

In order to make this precise, let us fix some terminology here. A *cut-off* function for Y is some non-negative valued $c \in C_c(Y)$ such that

$$\sum_{g\in\Gamma} c(gy) = 1$$

for all $y \in Y$; using properness and cocompactness, it is not difficult to see that such a c exists and we fix one from now on. If as usual γ denotes the action of Γ on $C_0(Y)$, then the *basic projection* associated to c is the element

$$p_Y \in C_c(G, C_0(Y)) \subseteq C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma$$

defined by

$$p_Y(g) := \gamma_g(c)c. \tag{A.2}$$

The associated class

$$[p_Y] \in K_0(C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma) = KK_0(\mathbb{C}, C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

does not depend on the choice of c. The *assembly map*

$$\mu : KK^\Gamma_*(C_0(Y), A) \to K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

is defined as the composition

$$KK^\Gamma_*(C_0(Y), A) \xrightarrow{j^\Gamma_r} KK_*(C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma, A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \xrightarrow{[p_Y]\otimes\cdot} KK(\mathbb{C}, A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

where the first map is Kasparov's descent morphism of [9, Theorem 3.11], and the second is Kasparov product with $[p_Y] \in KK(\mathbb{C}, C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma)$.

The assembly maps as defined above are functorial under proper, equivariant, continuous maps of the space Y appearing on the left hand side. Let $\underline{E}\Gamma$ be a universal Γ-space for proper actions as in [1, Section 1] and define

$$KK^\Gamma_*(\underline{E}\Gamma, A) := \lim_{Y \subseteq \underline{E}\Gamma} KK^\Gamma_*(C_0(Y), A)$$

where the limit is over all Γ-invariant cocompact subspaces of $\underline{E}\Gamma$. Finally, the *Baum-Connes assembly map* is the map

$$\mu : KK^\Gamma_*(\underline{E}\Gamma, A) \to K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

defined as the direct limit of the individual assembly maps defined above.

We will want to use the following concrete model for $\underline{E}\Gamma$. Let $X_\Gamma := \bigcup_{s \geqslant 0} P_s(\Gamma)$ equipped with ℓ^1-metric; as discussed in [1, Section 2], this is a model for the classifying space $\underline{E}\Gamma$. Moreover, the individual Rips complexes form a 'homotopy-cofinal' system inside the collection of Γ-cocompact equivariant subsets (ordered by inclusion) of X_Γ: precisely, we mean that for any cocompact $Y \subseteq X_\Gamma$, the inclusion map is (equivariantly, properly) homotopic to a map with image in some $P_s(\Gamma)$. Hence the Baum-Connes assembly map is equivalent to the direct limit of the assembly maps for the individual Rips complexes, i.e. the Baum-Connes assembly map can be thought of as a map

$$\mu : \lim_{s \to \infty} KK^\Gamma_*(C_0(P_s(\Gamma)), A) \to K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma).$$

We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem A.3. *Let Γ be a countable discrete group, and A a Γ-C^*-algebra. Let Y be a locally compact metric space, equipped with a proper, cocompact, and isometric Γ-action. Let*

$$\mu : KK^\Gamma_*(C_0(Y), A) \to K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

be the assembly map associated to this data. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} KK_*^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) & \xrightarrow{\mu} & K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K_*(C_L^*(Y; A)) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_0} & K_*(C^*(Y; A)) \end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are isomorphisms.

Moreover, let $s \leqslant t$ be non-negative real numbers, and say $P_s(\Gamma)$, $P_t(\Gamma)$ are the associated Rips complexes. Then with notation as above, there is a commutative diagram



Here the diagonal maps are induced by the inclusion $P_s(\Gamma) \to P_t(\Gamma)$, together with Remark A.2 for the Roe algebras and localization algebras. Hence taking the direct limit as $s \to \infty$ identifies the Baum-Connes assembly map

$$\mu : \lim_{s \to \infty} KK_*^\Gamma(P_s(\Gamma), A) \to K_*(A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

with the evaluation-at-zero map

$$\epsilon_0 : \lim_{s \to \infty} K_*(C_L^*(P_s(\Gamma); A)) \to \lim_{s \to \infty} K_*(C^*(P_s(\Gamma); A))$$

In order to explain the proof of Theorem A.3, we will need to define some auxiliary C^*-algebras. The statement in the second part of Theorem A.3 on compatibility with increasing the Rips parameter is straightforward from the proof of the first part, so we only give the proof of the first part. Say then that Y, H_Y, and A as above are all fixed.

Definition A.4. Let ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ be as above, and let C^* and C_L^* be shorthand for the associated Roe algebra and localization algebra. An adjointable

operator T on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ is *pseudolocal* if for any $f \in C_0(Y)$, the commutator $[f, T]$ is in $\mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$. Let D^* denote the C^*-algebra closure of the collection of all finite Γ-propagation, pseudolocal, Γ-invariant adjointable operators on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ inside $\mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$. Let D^*_L denote the C^*-algebra completion of all bounded, uniformly continuous functions

$$a : [0, \infty) \to D^*$$

such that the Γ-propagation of $a(t)$ is uniformly bounded for all t, such that the metric propagation tends to zero as t tends to infinity, and where the norm is given by $\sup_t \|a(t)\|_{D^*}$.

Note that C^* and C^*_L are ideals in D^* and D^*_L respectively.

We will prove the first part of Theorem A.3 by showing that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} KK_i^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) & \xrightarrow{\mu} & K_i(A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (i)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (ii)} \\ K_{i+1}(D^*/C^*) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & K_i(C^*) \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle (iii)} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \epsilon_0} \\ K_{i+1}(D^*_L/C^*_L) & \xrightarrow{(iv)} & K_i(C^*_L) \end{array} \tag{A.3}$$

such that the arrows labelled by roman numerals are all isomorphisms.

Remark A.5. The arrow labelled '∂' is the standard boundary map in the K-theory six-term exact sequence associated to the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C^* \longrightarrow D^* \longrightarrow D^*/C^* \longrightarrow 0 \ .$$

Note that we get for free from this proof that ∂ gives another model for the assembly map: this is a version with coefficients of the 'Paschke duality' model for the (coarse) Baum-Connes assembly map that is discussed for example in [17] and [5].

We now explain the main steps of the proof, starting with the top square. The arrow labelled (i) is a form of Paschke duality, and is shown to be an isomorphism by building on arguments in [6, Chapter 8]; the key technical points needed in addition are Fell's trick, Kasparov's stabilization theorem, and Kasparov's Hilbert module version

of Voiculescu's theorem [8]. The arrow labelled (ii) is induced by a Morita equivalence, which is canonical given the choice of cut-off function c. The argument that the top square commutes involves a significant amount of computation, and is based on [17].

For the bottom square, the arrow labelled (iii) is induced by the evaluation-at-zero map, and the arrow labelled (iv) is the boundary map from the K-theory six-term exact sequence associated to the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C_L^* \longrightarrow D_L^* \longrightarrow D_L^*/C_L^* \longrightarrow 0 \ .$$

In particular, commutativity of the bottom square is immediate from naturality of the six-term exact sequence. Our proofs that (iii) and (iv) are isomorphisms are closely based on arguments from [15] (which were in turn inspired by work of the third author [23], although that paper uses quite a different argument); in both cases, the proofs boil down to clever uses of Eilenberg swindles.

In the next two subsections, we look at the top ('Paschke duality') and bottom ('Localization algebra') squares separately.

Paschke duality square. Let us set up some conventions for equivariant KK-theory. We will work entirely in the odd KK and K groups: the even case can be deduced from the odd case by replacing A with $A \otimes C_0(\mathbb{R})$, where $C_0(\mathbb{R})$ has the trivial Γ-action (alternatively, the even case can be handled directly by arguments analogous to those used below for the odd case, but is notationally more complicated due to the necessity of dragging gradings through all the proofs).

Let B, C be (trivially graded) Γ-C^*-algebras. We will write cycles for $KK_1^\Gamma(B, C)$ as quadruples $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$ where $\mathcal{E}$ is a Hilbert C-module, F is an adjointable operator on $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$, β is a Γ-action on $\mathcal{E}$ by bounded linear isometries (not necessarily by adjointable operators, however), and $\phi : B \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E})$ is an equivariant $*$-homomorphism. Cycles for $KK_1(B, C)$ will analogously be written $(\mathcal{E}, F, \phi)$. There are then required to be various compatibilities between this data: see [9, Section 2] for precise definitions.

We will need the following Hilbert module version of Voiculescu's theorem, due to Kasparov [8, Theorem 5]; as the statement is a little

technical, we repeat the special case we need for the reader's convenience.

Theorem A.6. *Let B be a unital, nuclear, separable C^*-algebra, and C a σ-unital C^*-algebra. Assume that B is equipped with a unital $*$-representation $B \to \mathcal{B}(H)$ on some separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space H whose image contains no compact operators. Let moreover $H \otimes C$ be the standard Hilbert C-module, and note that there is a unital inclusion*

$$\pi : B \to \mathcal{B}(H) \to \mathcal{L}(H \otimes C),$$

where the map from the bounded operators on H to the adjointable operators on $H \otimes C$ is defined by amplification (see [10, page 35]*).*

Let $\phi : B \to \mathcal{L}(H \otimes C)$ be a unital $*$-homomorphism, and consider the sum $\phi \oplus \pi : B \to \mathcal{L}((H \otimes C) \oplus (H \otimes C))$. Then there is an adjointable isometry $V : H \otimes C \to (H \otimes C) \oplus (H \otimes C)$ such that the difference

$$V^* \pi(b) V - \phi(b)$$

is in $\mathcal{K}(H \otimes C)$ for all $b \in B$. □

While Kasparov's theorem also applies in the presence of a compact group action, there is unfortunately no general version for non-compact groups. To get around this issue in the case of proper actions that is relevant for us, we need a version of Fell's trick for Hilbert modules that we now discuss.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an equivariant Hilbert A-module, with Γ-action β, and recall that the Γ-action on A is denoted by α. We will denote by $\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$ the usual external tensor product of Hilbert modules (see [10, Chapter 4]), equipped with the Γ action $\lambda \otimes \beta$ defined as the tensor product of the left regular representation and β, the right action of A defined by $(\delta_g \otimes e) \cdot a := \delta_g \otimes ea$, and the inner product defined by

$$\langle \delta_{g_1} \odot e_1 \ , \ \delta_{g_2} \odot e_2 \rangle := \langle \delta_{g_1}, \delta_{g_2} \rangle_{\ell^2(\Gamma)} \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

With this structure, $\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$ is again an equivariant Hilbert C-module.

On the other hand, let $\ell^2_0(\Gamma)$ denote the elements of $\ell^2(\Gamma)$ with finite support, and let $\ell^2_0(\Gamma) \odot \mathcal{E}$ denote the algebraic tensor product (over $\mathbb{C}$). Let Γ act on $\ell^2_0(\Gamma) \odot \mathcal{E}$ by the tensor product $\lambda \odot 1$ of the left regular representation and the trivial representation. Define a right action of

A on $\ell^2_0(\Gamma) \odot \mathcal{E}$ by the formula $(\delta_g \odot e) \cdot a := \delta_g \odot e\alpha_{g^{-1}}(a)$, and define an A-valued inner product by the formula

$$\langle \delta_{g_1} \odot e_1 \ , \ \delta_{g_2} \odot e_2 \rangle := \langle \delta_{g_1}, \delta_{g_2} \rangle_{\ell^2(\Gamma)} \langle \beta_{g_1^{-1}}(e_1), \beta_{g_2^{-1}}(e_2) \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}$$

on elementary tensors, and extending. One checks that this is an A-valued inner product, so completion gives a Hilbert A-module, which we denote by $\ell^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$. The action of Γ moreover extends to an action on $\ell^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$, which we still denote by $\lambda \otimes 1$, and the result is an equivariant Hilbert A-module.

For $\delta_g \otimes e \in \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$, define $U(\delta_g \otimes e) := \delta_g \otimes \alpha_g(a)$. It is straightforward to check that U extends to an equivariant unitary isomorphism

$$U : \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E} \to \ell^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}),$$

of Hilbert A-modules. Using such a U to switch 'on / off' the second component of a Γ-action of this form is called *Fell's trick*.

Lemma A.7. *Let $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$ be a cycle representing some class $x \in KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$. Then there is a (non-canonical) way of associated a new cycle representing x to $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$ that has the following additional properties.*

(i) The new cycle has the form $({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, F, \epsilon, \pi)$, where F is a self-adjoint element of D^* and $\pi : C_0(Y) \to \mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$ is as defined in line (A.1) *above.*

(ii) The process takes: degenerate cycles to compact perturbations of degenerate cycles; unitary equivalences of cycles to compact perturbations of unitary equivalences of cycles; operator homotopies to operator homotopies; and direct sums of cycles to orthogonal sums of operators.

Proof. We just give the proof of part (i) above; part (ii) follows from the proof we give and some straightforward direct checks.

Recall that γ denotes the action of Γ on $C_0(Y)$, and that c is a fixed choice of cut-off function for the action of Γ on Y. Let $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$ be a cycle for $KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$. Cutting down to $C_0(Y) \cdot \mathcal{E}$, we may assume that the action of $C_0(Y)$ on $\mathcal{E}$ is nondegenerate (compare [9, Lemma 2.8]). Let $\mathcal{E}_c$ denote the equivariant subspace $C_c(Y) \cdot \mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{E}$, which is

dense by non-degeneracy. Define $V : \mathcal{E}_c \to \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$ by the formula

$$V : e \mapsto \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \delta_g \otimes \gamma_g(c)e;$$

the sum makes sense as properness of the Γ action combined with the compact support conditions on c and e imply that only finitely many terms are non-zero. Computing gives

$$\langle Ve, Ve \rangle = \sum_{g,h \in \Gamma} \langle \delta_g, \delta_h \rangle \langle \gamma_g(c)e, \gamma_h(c)e \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \gamma_g(c^2)e, e \right\rangle = \langle e, e \rangle,$$

from which it follows that V extends to an isometric linear map $V : \mathcal{E} \to \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$. It is straightforward to check moreover that V is equivariant, and has an adjoint defined by

$$V^* : \delta_g \otimes e \mapsto \gamma_g(c)e.$$

In particular, there is an equivariant submodule $\mathcal{E}'$ of $\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$ such that $V(\mathcal{E}) \oplus \mathcal{E}' \cong \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}$. Summing our cycle $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$ with the degenerate cycle $(\mathcal{E}', 1, \beta \otimes \lambda|_{\mathcal{E}'}, 0)$ and applying a unitary isomorphism, we may replace our original cycle by one of the form $(\ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{E}, F, \lambda \otimes \beta, \phi)$ (this F and ϕ are not the same as the original ones, but what exactly they are does not matter at this point; we abuse notation as the price to pay for not multiplying primes or subscripts).

Conjugating by the unitary appearing in Fell's trick, we may replace our cycle by one of the form $(\ell^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}), F, \lambda \otimes 1, \phi)$. Now, ignoring the Γ actions, Kasparov's stabilization theorem (see for example [10, Chapter 6]) embeds $\mathcal{E}$ as a complemented submodule of $H_Y \otimes H \otimes A$. Hence we may embed $\ell^2(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ *equivariantly* as a complemented submodule of $\ell^2(\Gamma, H_Y \otimes H \otimes A)$. Adding a degenerate cycle equipped with the zero action of $C_0(Y)$, we may thus assume that our class is represented by a cycle of the form

$$(\ell^2(\Gamma, H_Y \otimes H \otimes A), F, \lambda \otimes 1_{H_Y \otimes H \otimes A}, \phi).$$

Applying Fell's trick again, this time 'in reverse' then shows that there is a cycle of the form

$$({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, F, \epsilon, \phi) \tag{A.4}$$

representing the same class. Note from our construction so far that while the action of $C_0(Y)$ on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ need not be non-degenerate, we do at least have that the submodule $\phi(C_0(Y)) \cdot {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ is complemented.

Now, let $\widetilde{C_0(Y)}$ denote the unitization of $C_0(Y)$; abusing notation slightly, write

$$\pi : \widetilde{C_0(Y)} \to \mathcal{B}(H_Y) \to \mathcal{L}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A),$$

for the unital $*$-homomorphism extending our fixed π; here the first arrow is the unital extension of our fixed representation, and the second is amplification. The C^*-algebra $\widetilde{C_0(Y)}$ is nuclear, and we assumed that no non-zero element acts as a compact operator on H_Y. Hence (replacing ϕ with its unitization) Theorem A.6 gives an adjointable isometry

$$V : {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$$

with the property that

$$V^*\pi(f)V - \phi(f) \in \mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$$

for all $f \in C_0(Y)$.

Unfortunately, V does not need to respect the action of Γ, but we can rectify this as follows. Choose a family of equivariant isometries

$$\big(v_g : \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes H \to \ell^2(\Gamma) \otimes H\big)_{g\in\Gamma}$$

with the properties that $\sum_g v_g v_g^* = 1$ (convergence in the strong operator topology) and $v_h^* v_g = 0$ for $h \neq g$ (such exist by the classical version of Fell's trick), and abusing notation, also write v_g for the isometries on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ induced by these. Consider the submodule $\mathcal{E}_c := \phi(C_c(Y)) \cdot {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$, which is dense in the complemented submodule $\mathcal{E} := \phi(C_0(Y)) \cdot {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$. Define a map

$$W : \mathcal{E}_c \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, \quad e \mapsto \sum_{g\in\Gamma} v_g \widetilde{\epsilon}_g(V)\gamma_g(c)e,$$

which makes sense as the compact support conditions on c and $\mathcal{E}_c$ guarantee that the sum on the right is finite. Computing, for any

$e_1, e_2 \in \mathcal{E}_c$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle We_1, We_2\rangle &= \sum_{g,h\in\Gamma} \langle v_g\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(V)\gamma_g(c)e_1 \ , \ v_h\widetilde{\epsilon}_h(V)\gamma_h(c)e_2\rangle \\
&= \sum_{g,h\in\Gamma} \langle v_h^* v_g\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(V)\gamma_g(c)e_1 \ , \ \widetilde{\epsilon}_h(V)\gamma_h(c)e_2\rangle \\
&= \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \langle \widetilde{\epsilon}_g(V)\gamma_g(c)e_1 \ , \ \widetilde{\epsilon}_h(V)\gamma_h(c)e_2\rangle \\
&= \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \langle \epsilon_g(V^*V)\gamma_g(c)e_1, \gamma_g(c)e_2\rangle \\
&= \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \langle \gamma_g(c^2)e_1, e_2\rangle = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence W extends to an isometry $\mathcal{E} \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$, which is clearly equivariant. Extending W by zero on the complement of $\mathcal{E}$, we may consider W as an equivariant partial isometry $W : {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$, and it is straightforward to check (using that WW^* is the projection onto $\mathcal{E} := \phi(C_0(Y)) \cdot {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$) that

$$W^*\pi(f)W - \phi(f) \in \mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$$

for all $f \in C_0(Y)$. This gives us that

$$({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, W^*FW, \epsilon, \pi)$$

(where F is in the cycle in line (A.4)) is a cycle for $KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$ that is equivalent to our original cycle.

We now have a cycle $({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, F, \epsilon, \pi)$ on the correct equivariant $C_0(Y)$-A module ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$. Replacing the operator F by

$$\sum_g \gamma_g(c)\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(F)\gamma_g(c)$$

(the sum converges strictly, as is straightforward to see using elements of $C_c(Y) \cdot {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$ as we have a couple of times already), we get a new cycle which is just a compact perturbation of the old one, and for which F is equivariant and of finite Γ-propagation. Together with the other conditions defining a Kasparov cycle, this gives that F is an element of D^*. Finally, replacing F by $\frac{1}{2}(F + F^*)$, we may assume that F is self-adjoint and are done. □

The above lemma now allows us to define the map labelled (i) in Diagram (A.3), and show it to be an isomorphism.

Definition A.8. Define a homomorphism

$$\delta : KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) \to K_1(D^*/C^*)$$

by first representing a class x in $KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$ as a cycle of the form in Lemma A.7; then note the conditions on a Kasparov cycle imply that the image of $\frac{1}{2}(1 + F)$ in D^*/C^* is a projection p, and define $\delta(x) := [p]$.

The following proof is based on [6, Theorem 8.4.3]: see the discussion there for more details.

Corollary A.9. *The map δ from Definition A.8 above is a well-defined isomorphism.*

Proof. We note first that the equivalence relation on $KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$ may be taken to be that generated by operator homotopies, addition of degenerate cycles, and unitary equivalences. Indeed, as already noted there is a canonical process

$$F \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \gamma_g(c)\widetilde{\epsilon}_g(F)\gamma_g(c)$$

for replacing operators by Γ-invariant ones. Using this, it is not too difficult to see that the proof of the corresponding fact in the *non*-equivariant case [19] extends to our setting. The fact that δ is well-defined follows from this: operator homotopies give rise to homotopic projections, unitary equivalences to equivalent projections, and degenerate cycles to projections vulnerable to an Eilenberg swindle. Moreover, δ is a homomorphism as one can add orthogonal projections.

To see that δ is an isomorphism, note that it is surjective as every element of $K_*(D^*/C^*)$ can be represented by a projection in D^*/C^* (as opposed to a matrix algebra over it), and lifting to D^* gives rise to a cycle for $KK^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$. It is injective as the equivalence relations on projections and unitaries defining $K_*(D^*/C^*)$ lift to equivalences of Kasparov cycles. □

We now recall some more details about the KK-theoretic assembly map

$$\mu : KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) \to K_1(A \rtimes_r \Gamma).$$

We start with a class on the left hand side represented by some cycle $(\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi)$. Kasparov [9, 3.7 – 3.11] defines a *descent homomorphism*

$$j_r^\Gamma : KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) \to KK_1(C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma, A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

from equivariant KK groups to the non-equivariant KK groups of crossed products as follows. Define a scalar product on $C_c(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ with values in $C_c(\Gamma, A)$ by for each pair for $e_1, e_2 \in C_c(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ defining the function

$$\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle : \Gamma \to A$$

by the formula

$$\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle(g) := \sum_{h \in \Gamma} \alpha_{h^{-1}}\big(\langle e_1(h), e_2(hg) \rangle_{\mathcal{E}}\big).$$

Define a right action of $C_c(\Gamma, A)$ on $C_c(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ by the formula

$$(e \cdot a)(g) := \sum_{h \in G} e(h)\alpha_h(a(h^{-1}g)).$$

Kasparov shows that the inner product is positive, and thus it makes sense to define $\mathcal{E} \rtimes \Gamma$ as the Hilbert $A \rtimes_r \Gamma$-module defined by simultaneous completion (see [10, pages 4-5]). The module $\mathcal{E} \rtimes \Gamma$ is equipped with a left action of $C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma$ defined as the integrated form of the covariant representation defined by setting

$$(\widetilde{\phi}(f) \cdot e)(g) := \phi(f) \cdot e(g), \quad f \in C_0(Y),\ e \in C_c(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}),\ g \in \Gamma$$

and the unitary representation of Γ defined by

$$(u_g \cdot e)(h) := \epsilon_g(e(g^{-1}h)), \quad g, h \in \Gamma,\ e \in C_c(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}).$$

Kasparov shows that this integrates to a representation of $C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma$, also denoted $\widetilde{\phi}$, so $\mathcal{E} \rtimes \Gamma$ is a $C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma$-$A \rtimes_r \Gamma$ bimodule. An operator $\widetilde{F}$ is defined on $\mathcal{E}$ by the formula

$$(\widetilde{F} \cdot e)(g) := F \cdot e(g).$$

The map j_r^Γ is then defined by $j[\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi] = [\mathcal{E} \rtimes \Gamma, \widetilde{F}, \widetilde{\phi}]$.

The second step in defining the assembly map is to choose a cut-off function c for Y, and use it to construct a basic projection as in line (A.2) above and thus a class $[p_Y]$ in $K_0(C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma) \cong KK_0(\mathbb{C}, C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma)$. The assembly map is now defined by

$$\mu[\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi] := [p_Y] \bigotimes_{C_0(Y) \rtimes_r \Gamma} j_r^\Gamma[\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi] \in KK_*(\mathbb{C}, A \rtimes_r \Gamma).$$

where '$\otimes_{C_0(Y)\rtimes_r\Gamma}$' denotes Kasparov product over the C^*-algebra $C_0(Y)\rtimes_r \Gamma$. More explicitly, it is straightforward to check that this class is represented by the Kasparov cycle

$$(\widetilde{p_Y}(\mathcal{E}\rtimes\Gamma), \widetilde{p_Y}\widetilde{F}\widetilde{p_Y}, \iota)$$

for $KK_*(\mathbb{C}, A\rtimes_r\Gamma)$, where $\iota : \mathbb{C}\to\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}\rtimes\Gamma)$ is the unital representation given by $z\mapsto zp_Y$ (in what follows will usually omit the '$\widetilde{\phi}$' where this is unlikely to cause confusion). Hence

$$\mu[\mathcal{E}, F, \beta, \phi] = [p_Y(\mathcal{E}\rtimes\Gamma), p_Y\widetilde{F}p_Y, \iota].$$

In order to analyze this cycle, it will be extremely convenient to introduce a new Hilbert $A\rtimes_r\Gamma$ modules as follows; the following discussion is inspired by, but a little different from [17, Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.4]. Let $\ell^2_0(\Gamma)$ denote the subspace of finitely supported functions in $\ell^2(\Gamma)$. Write '$\odot$' for the uncompleted tensor product over $\mathbb{C}$, and define

$$\mathcal{E}_0 := H_Y\odot A\odot H\odot\ell^2_0(\Gamma),$$

which is a dense subspace of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$. Equip $\mathcal{E}_0$ with the restriction of the Γ-action ϵ on ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$; symbolically, this is given by

$$\epsilon_g(\xi\odot a\odot\eta\odot\delta_h) := u_g\xi\odot\alpha_g(a)\odot\eta\odot\delta_{gh}.$$

Provisionally define a new inner product on $\mathcal{E}_0$ with values in $C_c(\Gamma, A)\subseteq A\rtimes_r\Gamma$ by the formula

$$\langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}}(g) := \langle e_1, \epsilon_g(e_2)\rangle_{{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A},$$

and a right action of $C_c(\Gamma, A)$ by

$$e\cdot b := \sum_{g\in\Gamma}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}(e\cdot b(g)),$$

where the product '$e\cdot b(g)$' on the right refers to the A-module structure of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$. Define finally a linear map

$$U : \mathcal{E}_0\to{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A\rtimes\Gamma,\quad (Ue)(g) := c\cdot\epsilon_g(e). \tag{A.5}$$

A straightforward computation that we leave to the reader shows that for any $e_1, e_2\in\mathcal{E}_0$, we have

$$\langle Ue_1, Ue_2\rangle_{{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A\rtimes\Gamma} = \langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}} \tag{A.6}$$

and moreover for all $e\in\mathcal{E}_0$ and $b\in C_c(\Gamma, A)$ we have $(Ue)\cdot b = U(e\cdot b)$.

It follows from this that the form $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}}$ is positive semi-definite, and thus simultaneous completion as discussed in [10, pages 4-5] gives rise to a Hilbert $A\rtimes_r\Gamma$-module $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$. Moreover, the map in line (A.5) above extends to an isometric inclusion

$$U : \mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma} \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma.$$

Lemma A.10. *The map $U : \mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma} \to {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma$ is an adjointable isometry, with image exactly equal to $p_Y \cdot ({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma)$.*

Proof. An elementary computation shows that the adjoint of U is given for $e \in {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma$ by the formula

$$U^*e = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \epsilon_{g^{-1}}(c \cdot e(g));$$

combined with the formula in line (A.6), we now have that U is an adjointable isometry. Computing, for any $e \in {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma$ and $g \in \Gamma$

$$\begin{aligned}(UU^*e)(g) = c \cdot \epsilon_g(U^*e) &= c \cdot \epsilon_g\Big(\sum_{h\in\Gamma} \epsilon_{h^{-1}}(c \cdot e(h))\Big) \\ &= \sum_{h\in\Gamma} c\gamma_{gh^{-1}}(c) \cdot e(h).\end{aligned}$$

Making the change of variables $k = gh^{-1}$, this becomes

$$UU^*e(g) = \sum_{k\in\Gamma} c\gamma_k(c)e(k^{-1}g) = (p_Y \cdot e)(g).$$

In other words, the range projection of U is p_Y, which completes the proof. □

Now, let $E : A \rtimes_r \Gamma \to A$ denote the faithful conditional expectation defined by $b \mapsto b(e)$, where e here denotes the identity element of Γ. Following the discussion in [10, pages 57-58], this conditional expectation gives rise to a 'localization' Hilbert A-module $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma,E}$ defined as the separated completion of $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ for the A-valued inner product defined by

$$\langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma,E}} := E(\langle e_1, e_2\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}}).$$

Moreover, there is a $*$-representation

$$\pi_E : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}) \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma,E}).$$

defined on the dense subspace of $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma,E}$ defined as the image of $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ by the formula $\pi_E(T)\cdot e = T\cdot e$; as in our case E is faithful, π_E is isometric.

Lemma A.11. *The localization $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma,E}$ identifies naturally with ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$: more precisely, on the dense subspace of these A-modules defined by $\mathcal{E}_0$, the inner products agree.*

Moreover, having made this identification, the $*$-representation π_E takes $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})$ onto C^*.

Proof. The first part is clear from the formulas involved. For the second part, recall first that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})$ is generated by operators of the form

$$\theta_{e_1,e_2} : e \mapsto e_1\langle e_2, e\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}},$$

where e_1, e_2, e are in $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ (or just in the dense subspace $\mathcal{E}_0$). Computing,

$$\theta_{e_1,e_2}(e) = \sum_{g\in\Gamma}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}(e_1\langle e_2, e_2\rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}}(g)) = \sum_{g\in\Gamma}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}(e_1\langle e_2, \epsilon_g(e)\rangle_{{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A}).$$

Now, specialize to the case where $e_i = \xi_i\odot a_i\odot\eta_i\odot\delta_{h_i}$ for $i\in\{1,2\}$, and $e = \xi\odot a\odot\eta\odot\delta_h$ are all given by elementary tensors, which we may regard equally as elements of ${}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$. The first part combined with the above computation then says that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_E(\theta_{e_1,e_2})e &= \sum_{g\in\Gamma}\epsilon_{g^{-1}}(e_1\langle e_2, \epsilon_g(e)\rangle_{{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A})\\ &= \sum_{g\in\Gamma}\langle\eta_2,\eta\rangle\langle\xi_1, u_g\xi_2\rangle\langle\delta_{h_1},\delta_{gh}\rangle u_{g^{-1}}\xi_1\otimes\alpha_{g^{-1}}(a_1a_2^*)a\otimes\eta\otimes\delta_{g^{-1}h_1}.\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that the operator $\pi_E(\theta_{e_1,e_2})$ is in C^*, and moreover that linear combinations of such operators are dense in C^*, completing the proof. □

At this point, we have that $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ is an $A\rtimes_r\Gamma$-module, and that the compact operators on it identify naturally with C^*. To complete the proof that $A\rtimes_r\Gamma$ is Morita equivalent with C^*, it will suffice to show that $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ is full. For the sake of completeness, as well as to ease the subsequent analysis, the next lemma gives a more precise statement.

To state it, define an $C_c(\Gamma, A)$-valued inner product on $\mathcal{E}_0$ by the formula

$$\langle \xi_1 \odot a_1 \odot \eta_1 \odot \delta_{h_1} \ , \ \xi_2 \odot a_2 \odot \eta_2 \odot \delta_{h_2} \rangle(g) := \langle \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle \langle \delta_g, \delta_{h_1^{-1} h_2} \rangle \alpha_{h_1^{-1}}(a_1^* a_2).$$

In other words, identifying $\ell^2_0(\Gamma) \odot A$ with $C_c(\Gamma, A)$ in the natural way, this is $H_Y \odot H \odot C_c(\Gamma, A)$ with its natural $C_c(\Gamma, A)$-valued inner product. Thus it is positive definite, and completion gives rise to the standard $A \rtimes_r \Gamma$-module $H_Y \otimes H \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma$.

Lemma A.12. *The map*

$$V : \mathcal{E}_0 \to \mathcal{E}_0, \quad \xi \odot a \odot \eta \odot \delta_h \mapsto u_{h^{-1}} \xi \odot \alpha_{h^{-1}}(a) \odot \eta \odot \delta_{h^{-1}}$$

extends to an isometric isomorphism

$$V : \mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma} \to H_Y \otimes H \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma.$$

In particular, conjugation by V induces an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma}) \cong \mathcal{K}(H_Y \otimes H) \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma,$$

and combining with Lemma A.11, $C^* \cong \mathcal{K} \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma$.

Proof. Computing,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle V(\xi_1 \odot a_1 \odot \eta_1 \odot \delta_{h_1}) \ , \ V(\xi_2 \odot a_2 \odot \eta_2 \odot \delta_{h_2}) \rangle_{H_Y \otimes H \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma}(g) \\
&\quad = \langle u_{h^{-1}} \xi, u_{h_2}^{-1} \xi_2 \rangle \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle \langle \delta_g, \delta_{h_1 h_2^{-1}} \rangle \alpha_{h_1}(\alpha_{h_1^{-1}}(a_1^*) \alpha_{h_2}(a_2)) \\
&\quad = \langle \xi, u_{h_1 h_2}^{-1} \xi_2 \rangle \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle \langle \delta_g, \delta_{h_1 h_2^{-1}} \rangle a_1^* \alpha_{h_1 h_2^{-1}}(a_2) \\
&\quad = \langle \xi, u_g^{-1} \xi_2 \rangle \langle \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle \langle \delta_{h_1}, \delta_{g h_2} \rangle a_1^* \alpha_g(a_2) \\
&\quad = \langle \xi_1 \odot a_1 \odot \eta_1 \odot \delta_{h_1} \ , \ \xi_2 \odot a_2 \odot \eta_2 \odot \delta_{h_2} \rangle_{\mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma}}(g).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence V extends to an isometry from $\mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma}$ into $H_Y \otimes H \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma$. A standard computation shows that V is adjointable, with adjoint given on $\mathcal{E}_0$ by the same formula as for V, i.e.

$$V^*(\xi \odot a \odot \eta \odot \delta_h) = u_{h^{-1}} \xi \odot \alpha_{h^{-1}}(a) \odot \eta \odot \delta_{h^{-1}}.$$

Clearly from these formulas V has dense image, and thus extends to a unitary isomorphism as claimed.

To complete the statement about the compact operators, note that we now have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma}) &\cong \mathcal{K}(H_Y \otimes H \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \cong \mathcal{K}(H_Y \otimes H) \otimes \mathcal{K}(A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \\
&\cong \mathcal{K}(H_Y \otimes H) \otimes A \rtimes_r \Gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first isomorphism is conjugation by V, the second is a standard general isomorphism for external tensor products of Hilbert modules discussed in [10, page 37], and the third is the standard identification $\mathcal{K}(B) \cong B$ for any C^*-algebra considered as a Hilbert module over itself as discussed in [10, page 10]. □

We now go back to commutativity of the top square of diagram (A.3). Filling in some more details, the top square in Diagram (A.3) looks as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A) & \longrightarrow & KK_1(\mathbb{C}, A \rtimes_r \Gamma) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\kappa} & K_1(A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \\
 & & & & \cong \big\uparrow\big\downarrow s \\
 & & & & K_1((A \rtimes_r \Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{K}) \\
\delta \big\downarrow \cong & & & & \cong \big\uparrow\big\downarrow \mathrm{ad}_V \\
 & & & & K_1(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A \rtimes_r \Gamma})) \\
 & & & & \cong \big\uparrow\big\downarrow \pi_E \\
K_0(D^*/C^*) & & \xrightarrow[\partial]{} & & K_1(C^*) \ ,
\end{array}$$

where in the above:

(i) the map labelled δ is the Paschke duality isomorphism of Corollary A.9;
(ii) the map labelled ∂ is the standard boundary map in K-theory;
(iii) the composition of the top two horizontal arrows is the the Baum-Connes assembly map μ (we have explicitly included the isomorphism κ);
(iv) the map labelled π_E is the map on K-theory induced by the isomorphism of Lemma A.11;
(v) the map labelled ad_V is the map on K-theory induced by conjugation by the unitary isomorphism of Lemma A.12;
(vi) the map labelled s is the stabilization isomorphism in K-theory.

Consider now what happens to a class in $KK_1^\Gamma(C_0(Y), A)$ as it goes around this diagram. Using Lemma A.7, we may assume our class is of the form $[{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, F, \epsilon, \pi]$, where F is in D^*. As discussed above, the assembly map μ along the top row of diagram (A.3) takes this class to

$$[p_Y \cdot ({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A \rtimes \Gamma), p_Y \widetilde{F} p_Y, \iota] \in KK_1(\mathbb{C}, A \rtimes_r \Gamma)$$

where ι is the unit representation of $\mathbb{C}$. Using Lemma A.10, this class is the same as $[\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}, U^*\widetilde{F}U, \iota]$. Lemma A.12 implies that $\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma}$ is actually a standard module over $A \rtimes_r \Gamma$, and thus one of the standard formulations of the isomorphism between $KK_*(\mathbb{C}, B)$ and $K_*(B)$ (see [2, 17.5.4 – 17.5.6]) says that this class corresponds to the image of the projection $\frac{1}{2}(1 + U^*\widetilde{F}U)$ under the composition

$$\partial : K_0(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})) \to K_1(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})) \to K_1(A \rtimes_r \Gamma),$$

of the K-theory boundary map and the combination of the isomorphism ad_V and the stabilization isomorphism. On the other hand, going around the square to the bottom right corner in the other direction, our class $[{}_Y\mathcal{E}_A, F, \epsilon, \pi]$ goes to the image of the projection $\frac{1}{2}(1+F)$ in D^*/C^* under the boundary map

$$\partial : K_0(D^*/C^*) \to K_1(C^*).$$

Consider then the commutative diagram of boundary maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_0(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & K_1(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})) \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle \pi_E^{-1}} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \pi_E^{-1}} \\ K_0(D^*/C^*) & \xrightarrow[\partial]{} & K_1(C^*) \end{array},$$

where the vertical maps are induced by the inverse of π_E restricted to its image. To complete the proof, the discussion above implies that it will be enough to show that the projections

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 + U^*\widetilde{F}U) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_E^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}(1 + F))$$

in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})/\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{E}_{A\rtimes_r\Gamma})$ are the same. For this the following lemma suffices, so it completes our analysis of the top sqaure.

Lemma A.13. *For any $F \in D^*$,*

$$\pi_E(U^*\widetilde{F}U) - F$$

is in C^*.

Proof. We compute what the operator $\pi_E(U^*\widetilde{F}U)$ does on an element e of $\mathcal{E}_0 \subseteq {}_Y\mathcal{E}_A$.

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_E(U^*\widetilde{F}U)e = U^*\widetilde{F}Ue &= \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \epsilon_{g^{-1}}(c(\widetilde{F}Ue)(g)) = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \epsilon_{g^{-1}}(cF(Ue)(g)) \\ &= \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \epsilon_{g^{-1}}(cFc\epsilon_g(e)) = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)F\gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)e,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality used Γ-invariance of F. Hence

$$\pi_E(U^*\widetilde{F}U) - F = \sum_{g\in\Gamma} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)F\gamma_{g^{-1}}(c) - F.$$

To see that this operator is in C^*, we must show that it is Γ-invariant, has finite Γ-propagation, and is A-locally compact. The first two of these are clear, as they hold for each of the two terms individually. To see that the operator is A locally compact, let f be an element of $C_c(Y)$. Let $S := \{g \in \Gamma \mid f \cdot \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c) \neq 0\}$, which is finite by properness of the action, and compact support of f and c. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}f \cdot \Big(\sum_{g\in\Gamma} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)F\gamma_{g^{-1}}(c) - F\Big) &= f \cdot \Big(\sum_{g\in S} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)F\gamma_{g^{-1}}(c) - \sum_{g\in S} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c^2)F\Big) \\ &= f \cdot \Big(\sum_{g\in S} \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)[F, \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c)]\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses that $\sum \gamma_{g^{-1}}(c^2) = 1$. The sum in parentheses is a finite sum of operators in $\mathcal{K}({}_Y\mathcal{E}_A)$, so we are done. □

Localization algebra square. In studying the bottom square, it will help to introduce some auxiliary C^*-algebras. For a C^*-algebra B, let TB denote the C^*-algebra of all bounded, uniformly continuous functions from $[0,\infty)$ to B. We then have a commutative diagram of short exact sequences of C^*-algebras.

(A.7)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & C^* & \longrightarrow & D^* & \longrightarrow & D^*/C^* & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & TC^* & \longrightarrow & TD^* & \longrightarrow & TD^*/TC^* & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C^*_L & \longrightarrow & D^*_L & \longrightarrow & D^*_L/C^*_L & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Here the upper three vertical arrows are all induced by evaluation-at-zero maps, while the lower three vertical arrows are all induced by simply forgetting the condition on metric propagation in the definition of D_L^* and C_L^*. As already mentioned, the bottom square in Diagram (A.3) is induced by the boundary maps from the top and bottom sequences in Diagram (A.7), and thus automatically commutes, so it remains to show that the maps labelled (iii) and (iv) in Diagram (A.3) are isomorphisms. Indeed, that (iii) is an isomorphism follows from Lemmas A.14 and A.15 below, while isomorphism of (iv) is Lemma A.16 below, so these lemmas complete our analysis of the bottom square.

Lemma A.14. *(Compare* [15, Proposition 3.6]*). The upper three vertical maps in Diagram* (A.7) *induce isomorphisms on K-theory.*

Proof. Using the six term exact sequence and the five lemma, it suffices to show the two maps on the left induce isomorphisms on K-theory. For this it suffices to show the following: if B is a C^*-algebra which has a stability structure in the sense of Definition 6.4, then the evaluation-at-zero map $TB \to B$ induces an isomorphism on K-theory. Using the six term exact sequence again, it suffices to show that if B is any C^*-algebra with a stability structure, then

$$T_0B := \{f \in TB \mid f(0) = 0\}$$

has trivial K-theory. This is what we will now do.

Let (u_n) be the unitaries in the definition of a stability structure. For an element $b \in T_0(B)$, extend b to a function $b : \mathbb{R} \to B$ by setting $b(t) = 0$ for all $t < 0$. For each n, define an inclusion

$$\mu_n : T_0B \to T_0B, \quad (\mu_n b)(t) = b(t - n).$$

Then each μ_n is a $*$-homomorphism. Moreover, the map

$$\mu : T_0B \to T_0B, \quad b \mapsto \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n \mu_n(b) u_n^*$$

is a $*$-homomorphism, as for any fixed t, all but finitely many of the functions $\mu_n(b)$ take the value zero at t. Conjugating by the isometry

$$v = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_{n+1} u_n^*$$

shows that μ induces the same map on K-theory as the map $\mu' : T_0B \to T_0B$ defined by

$$\mu'(b) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n \mu_{n-1}(b) u_n^*,$$

and applying a shift homotopy at each 'level' indexed by n (plus using uniform continuity of b) shows that μ' induces the same map on K-theory as $\mu^{+1} : T_0B \to T_0B$ defined by

$$\mu^{+1}(b) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n \mu_n u_n^*.$$

Then we clearly have that

$$\mu = \mathrm{ad}_{u_0} \circ \mu_0 + \mu^{+1}$$

as $*$-homomorphisms (the right hand side is a $*$-homomorphism as μ_0 and μ^+1 have orthogonal images: compare Lemma 6.3 above). Note that ad_{u_0} is just conjugation by an isometry in the multiplier algebra of T_0B, and thus defines the identity on K-theory (see Lemma 6.1 above). Hence passing to induced maps on K-theory gives

$$\mu_* = (\mathrm{ad}_{u_0})_* \circ (\mu_0)_* + \mu_*^{+1} = \mathrm{id} + \mu_*,$$

and cancelling μ_* gives that the identity map is zero, which gives $K_*(T_0(B)) = 0$ as claimed. □

Lemma A.15. *(Compare* [15, Proposition 2.3]*). With notation as in Diagram* (A.7) *above, the map $D_L^*/C_L^* \to TD^*/TC^*$ is an isomorphism of C^*-algebras.*

Proof. We define an inverse map. As the action of Γ on Y is proper, it is not too difficult to see that for each n, there exists a partition of unity $\{\phi_{i,n} : Y \to [0,1]\}_{i \in I_n}$, which is Γ-invariant, such that each $\phi_{i,n}$ has compact support of diameter at most $1/n$, and such that $\sum_{i \in I_n} \phi_{i,n}^2(y) = 1$ for all $y \in Y$. Define a map $\Phi : TD^* \to D_L^*$ by stipulating that when $t \in [n, n+1]$,

$$\Phi(a)(t) := (n+1-t) \sum_{i \in I_{n+1}} \phi_{i,n+1} a(t) \phi_{i,n+1} + (t-n) \sum_{i \in I_{n+2}} \phi_{i,n+2} a(t) \phi_{i,n+2}.$$

Then it is not too difficult to see that Φ is a well-defined complete contraction, that Φ descends to a well-defined $*$-homomorphism on the quotients, and that $\Phi(a(t)) - a(t) \in TC^*$ for all a and all t (compare [15, Lemma 2.2]). The result follows from this. □

Lemma A.16. *(Compare* [15, Proposition 3.5]*). The C^*-algebra D_L^* has trivial K-theory.*

Proof. Again, we use the stability structure $(u_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ on D_L^* coming from a decomposition of the 'auxiliary Hilbert space' H into countably many infinite dimensional summands. For each n, define a $*$-homomorphism $\mu_n : D_L^* \to D_L^*$ by the formula

$$(\mu_n(a))(t) = a(t+n).$$

Then we may define $\mu : D_L^* \to M(D_L^*)$ by the formula

$$\mu(a) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n \mu_n(a) u_n^*.$$

Note however, that the image actually lands in D_L^*, not its multiplier algebra: the point is that $[\mu_n(a)(t), f] \to 0$ in norm as $n \to \infty$ for any $f \in C_0(Y)$ and $t \in [0, \infty]$, using the propagation condition (compare the proof of [16, Proposition 5.18]). A combination of conjugation by an isometry and a homotopy quite analogous to the argument of Lemma A.14 shows that μ induces the same map on K-theory as μ_{+1}, where the latter is defined by the same formula, except that the sum starts at $n = 1$. Finally, we have that as maps on K-theory

$$\mu_* = (\mathrm{ad}_{u_0})_* \circ (\mu_0)_* + \mu_*^{+1} = \mathrm{id} + \mu_*,$$

whence the identity induces the zero map on K-theory, and we are done. □

References

[1] P. Baum, A. Connes, and N. Higson. Classifying space for proper actions and K-theory of group C^*-algebras. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 167:241–291, 1994.

[2] B. Blackadar. *K-Theory for Operator Algebras*. Cambridge University Press, second edition, 1998.

[3] E. Guentner, R. Willett, and G. Yu. Dynamic asymptotic dimension: relation to dynamics, topology, coarse geometry, and C^*-algebras. To appear, Math. Ann., 2016.

[4] N. Higson and G. Kasparov. E-theory and KK-theory for groups which act properly and isometrically on Hilbert space. *Invent. Math.*, 144:23–74, 2001.

[5] N. Higson and J. Roe. On the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture. *London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes*, 227:227–254, 1995.

[6] N. Higson and J. Roe. *Analytic K-homology*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

[7] N. Higson, J. Roe, and G. Yu. A coarse Mayer-Vietoris principle. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 114:85–97, 1993.

[8] G. Kasparov. Hilbert C^*-modules: theorems of Stinespring and Voiculescu. *J. Operator Theory*, 4:133–150, 1980.

[9] G. Kasparov. Equivariant KK-theory and the Novikov conjecture. *Invent. Math.*, 91(1):147–201, 1988.

[10] E. C. Lance. *Hilbert C^*-modules (a toolkit for operator algebraists)*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[11] P.-Y. Le Gall. Théorie de Kasparov équivariante et groupoïdes. I. *K-theory*, 16(4):361–390, 1999.

[12] H. Oyono-Oyono and G. Yu. On quantitative operator K-theory. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 65(2):605–674, 2015.

[13] H. Oyono-Oyono and G. Yu. Quantitative K-theory and Künneth formula for operator algebras. arXiv:1608.02725, 2016.

[14] G. K. Pedersen. *C^*-Algebras and their Automorphism Groups*. Academic Press, 1979.

[15] Y. Qiao and J. Roe. On the localization algebra of Guoliang Yu. *Forum Math.*, 22(4):657–665, 2010.

[16] J. Roe. Coarse cohomology and index theory on complete Riemannian manifolds. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 104(497), 1993.

[17] J. Roe. Comparing analytic assembly maps. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 53(2):1–8, 2002.

[18] M. Rørdam, F. Larsen, and N. Laustsen. *An Introduction to K-Theory for C^*-Algebras*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[19] G. Skandalis. Some remarks on Kasparov theory. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 56:337–347, 1984.

[20] J.-L. Tu. La conjecture de Baum-Connes pour les feuilletages moyennables. *K-theory*, 17:215–264, 1999.

[21] N. E. Wegge-Olsen. *K-Theory and C^*-Algebras (A Friendly Approach)*. Oxford University Press, 1993.

[22] R. Willett. Some notes on property A. In G. Arzhantseva and A. Valette, editors, *Limits of Graphs in Group Theory and Computer Science*, pages 191–281. EPFL press, 2009.

[23] G. Yu. Localization algebras and the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture. *K-theory*, 11(4):307–318, 1997.

[24] G. Yu. The Novikov conjecture for groups with finite asymptotic dimension. *Ann. of Math.*, 147(2):325–355, 1998.

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

E-mail address: erik@math.hawaii.edu

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

E-mail address: rufus@math.hawaii.edu

Texas A&M University and Shanghai Center for Mathematical Sciences.

E-mail address: guoliangyu@math.tamu.edu